arXiv:1610.07229v2 [cs.DS] 26 Oct 2016

A POLYNOMIAL KERNEL FOR DISTANCE-HEREDITARY VERTEX DELETION

EUN JUNG KIM AND O-JOUNG KWON

Abstract. A graph is *distance-hereditary* if for any pair of vertices, their distance in every connected induced subgraph containing both vertices is the same as their distance in the original graph. Distance hereditary graphs are exactly the graphs with rank-width at most 1. The Distance-Hereditary Vertex Deletion problem asks, given a graph G on n vertices and an integer k, whether there is a set S of at most k vertices in G such that $G-S$ is distance-hereditary. It was shown by Eiben, Ganian, and Kwon (MFCS' 16) that Distance-Hereditary Vertex Deletion can be solved in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, and they asked whether the problem admits a polynomial kernelization. We show that this problem admits a polynomial kernel, answering this question positively. For this, we use a similar idea for obtaining an approximate solution for Chordal Vertex Deletion due to Jansen and Pilipczuk (SODA' 17) to obtain an approximate solution with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices when the problem is a Yes-instance, and use Mader's $\mathcal{S}$-path theorem to hit all obstructions containing exactly one vertex of the approximate solution. Then we exploit the structure of split decompositions of distance-hereditary graphs to reduce the total size. Using Mader's $\mathcal{S}$-path theorem in the context of kernelization might be of independent interest.

1. Introduction

The *graph modification problems*, in which we want to transform a graph to satisfy a certain property with as few graph modifications as possible, have been extensively studied. For instance, the Vertex Cover and Feedback Vertex Set problems are graph modification problems where the target graphs are edgeless graphs and forests, respectively. By the classic result of Lewis and Yannakakis [24], it is known that for all non-trivial hereditary properties, the corresponding vertex deletion problems are NP-complete. Hence, the research effort has been directed toward designing algorithms such as approximation and parameterized algorithms. Especially, graph modification problems have drawn much attention in the view of parameterized complexity.

An instance of a parameterized graph problem Π consists of an input graph G on n vertices and a parameter k. We say that a parameterized graph problem Π is *fixed-parameter tractable*, shortly FPT, if there exists an algorithm to solve it in time $f(k)\cdot n^{O(1)}$ for some computable function f. Deciding whether a problem admits such an algorithm or not, and designing an algorithm with a smaller function $f(k)$ if one exists, are of major interest in parameterized complexity. As a folklore, that a problem is fixed-parameter tractable is equivalent to admitting an efficient preprocessing algorithm into an instance whose size

Date: October 27, 2016.

Key words and phrases. rank-width, kernelization, distance-hereditary.

The second author was supported by ERC Starting Grant PARAMTIGHT (No. 280152) and also supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (ERC consolidator grant DISTRUCT, agreement No. 648527).

is bounded solely by a function of k. Formally, a *kernelization* of a parameterized graph problem Π is a polynomial-time algorithm which, given an instance (G, k) of Π, outputs an equivalent instance (G', k') of Π with $|V(G')| + k' \leq h(k)$ for some computable function h. The resulting instance (G', k') of a kernelization is called a *kernel*. Especially when h is a polynomial function, Π is said to admit a *polynomial kernel*.

A graph G is called *distance-hereditary* if for every connected induced subgraph H of G and every two vertices u and v in H, the distance between u and v in H is the same as the distance in G. For a graph G, a vertex subset $X \subseteq V(G)$ is a *distance-hereditary modulator*, or a DH-modulator in short, if $G - X$ is a distance-hereditary graph. We formulate our central problem.

Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion
Input : A graph G, an integer k
Parameter : k
Question : Does G contain a DH-modulator of size at most k?

The class of distance-hereditary graphs was introduced by Howorka [19], and attracted much attention after the work of Bandelt and Murder [2] in 1982. This graph class was characterized in a various way; for instance, distance-hereditary graphs are exactly the graphs that can be constructed from a vertex by a sequence of adding twins or leaves [2], or these graphs are $(5, 2)$-crossing chordal graphs meaning that every induced cycle of length at least 5 contains two crossing chords [19]. On the other hand, this graph class gained renewed attention after Oum [28] showed that distance-hereditary graphs are exactly the graphs of *rank-width* at most 1, where rank-width is one of the useful graph width parameters measuring how easy it is to decompose a graph into a certain tree-like structure.

As a generalization of the meta-theorem on graphs of bounded tree-width [5], together with an algorithm to find a rank-decomposition [30, 18, 29], the result of Courcelle, Makowski, and Rotics [6] implies that every problem expressible in an MSO_1-logic formula can be decided in cubic time on graphs of bounded rank-width. However, this cannot be generalized to all problems expressible in an MSO_2-logic formula; Fomin et al. [13] showed that Edge Dominating Set and Hamiltonian Cycle are W[1]-hard parameterized by rank-width. Since the distance to a class of graphs with constant rank-width is more restricted than rank-width itself, we may expect to obtain an FPT algorithm for such problems parameterized by the distance to a class of graphs of constant rank-width. For this reason, before discussing such possible tractability, the existence of an efficient algorithm for Rank-width w Vertex Deletion problem, which is a problem of asking whether there is a vertex set S of G where $G - S$ has rank-width at most w is being focused on. The Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion problem is a specialization of Rank-width w Vertex Deletion when $w = 1$.

In a similar context, Tree-width w Vertex Deletion parameterized by the solution size k has been studied in several papers. Fomin et al. [14], and independently Kim et al. [22] showed that there is a single-exponential FPT time algorithm for solving Tree-width w Vertex Deletion. The former group also showed that there is a polynomial kernel for this problem where the exponent of k in the kernel size depends on the tree-width w. Later, Giannopoulou et al. [15] established that Tree-width w Vertex Deletion does not have uniformly polynomial kernels unless $NP \subseteq coNP/poly$.

Kanté et al. [21] observed that Rank-width w Vertex Deletion can be solved in FPT time using the machinery of meta-theorem on graphs of bounded rank-width, and raised a question whether there is an elementary FPT algorithm. Eiben, Ganian, and Kwon [9] first answered this question by providing a single-exponential time algorithm for the Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion problem. Until now, it is not known whether Rank-width w Vertex Deletion admits a polynomial kernel, even for $w = 1$.

Our Contribution. In this paper, we show that Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion admits a polynomial kernel.

Theorem 1.1. Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion *parameterized by k admits a polynomial kernel.*

The algorithm of Theorem 1.1 can be divided into two parts. First, we find an approximate DH-modulator of size at most $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ if the given instance is a Yes-instance (see Section 3, also 7.2). For this, we closely follow the approach of Jansen and Pilipczuk [20] used to obtain an approximate solution for Chordal Vertex Deletion. Then Mader's $\mathcal{S}$-path theorem plays an important role to obtain a *good* DH-modulator of size $O(k^6)$, that satisfies the property that for each $v \in S$, $G[(V(G) \setminus S) \cup \{v\}]$ is also distance-hereditary (Proposition 7.1). The application of Mader's $\mathcal{S}$-path theorem in the context of kernelization is new to us, and it can be of independent interest for other problems.

In the second part, assuming that a *good* DH-modulator S is given, we reduce the remaining graph $G - S$. We first give a way to bound the size of each vertex subset C in $G - S$ where vertices in C are pairwise twins in $G - S$. Two vertices v and w of G are *twins* if they have the same neighbors in $G - \{v, w\}$. Even this is non-trivial since vertices in C may have arbitrary neighbors on S (see Section 4). We use the properties that every obstruction for distance-hereditary graphs does not contain any twins, and the obstruction set consists of graphs with at most 6 vertices or an induced cycle of length at least 7 in Figure 1. By usual counting argument with all possible connections with C and S and neighbors of C in $G - S$, we can bound the size of such twin class C into $\mathcal{O}(k|S|^4)$ (Lemma 4.1).

In the next step, we establish a way to bound the number of non-trivial components of $G - S$ (Section 5) by $O(k|S|^2)$. A key observation here is that for two vertices u, v in S, if there are at least $k + 2$ components C of $G - S$ where u and v have non-empty distinct neighbors on C, then any solution for Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion should contain u or v (Lemma 5.1). Also, we can bound the number of trivial components of $G - S$, as they form a set of pairwise twins in $G - S$. Thus, it remains to bound the size of each non-trivial component of $G - S$.

We use split decompositions of distance-hereditary graphs to bound the size of the non-trivial components C (Section 6). We use the property of our approximate DH-modulator that for every component C of $G - S$ and $v \in S$, $G[V(C) \cup \{v\}]$ is distance-hereditary. From the result by Gioan and Paul [16], we know the exact place to put $v \in S$ when we extend a split decomposition of C to a split decomposition of $G[V(C) \cup \{v\}]$. We mark all these places for all vertices in S, and then reduce the unmarked parts. We will show that the number of total bags in a component is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(k|S|)$. By summing up, we conclude that there is a kernel with $\mathcal{O}$(num of connected components $\times$ num of bags in a component$\times$num of twins in a bag) $= \mathcal{O}(k|S|^2 \cdot k|S| \cdot k|S|^4) = \mathcal{O}(k^3|S|^7) = \mathcal{O}(k^{45})$.



FIGURE 1. The induced subgraph obstructions for distance-hereditary graphs.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Basic graph notations. In this paper, all graphs are simple and finite. Given a graph G, we write the vertex set and edge set of G as $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ respectively. Unless otherwise stated, we reserve n to denote $|V(G)|$. For a vertex v of G, we denote by $G - v$ the graph obtained from G by removing v and all edges incident with it. For a vertex subset S of G, we denote by $G - S$ the graph obtained by removing all vertices in S. For a vertex subset S of G, let $G[S]$ be the subgraph of G induced on S. For a vertex v in G, we denote by $N_G(v)$ the set of all neighbors of v in G. For a vertex subset S of G, we denote by $N_G(S)$ the set of all vertices in $V(G) \setminus V(S)$ that have a neighbor in S, and let $N_G[S] := N_G(S) \cup S$. If the graph G is clear from the context, then we may remove G from the notation.

For two vertex sets A and B in G, we say A is *complete* to B if for every $v \in A$ and $w \in B$, v is adjacent to w, and A is *anti-complete* to B if for every $v \in A$ and $w \in B$, v is not adjacent to w. A *star* is a tree with a distinguished vertex, called the *center*, adjacent to all other vertices. A *complete graph* is a graph with all possible edges. Two vertices v and w of a graph G are *twins* if they have the same neighbors in $G - \{v, w\}$. We say a vertex subset S of G is a *twin set* of G if the vertices in S are pairwise twins in G.

A graph H is a *biclique* if there is a bipartition of $V(H)$ into non-empty sets $A \uplus B$ such that any two vertices $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ is adjacent. Notice that there may be edges among the vertices of A or B. For a vertex subset $K \subseteq V(G)$, we say that K is a biclique of G if $G[K]$ is a biclique.

For a connected graph G, a vertex subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ is called a *balanced vertex separator* of G if every component of $G - S$ has at most $\frac{2}{3}n$ vertices. We allow $V(G)$ to be a trivial balanced vertex separator of G. For a vertex subset S of G, a path is called an *S-path* if its end vertices are in S and all other internal vertices are in $V(G) \setminus S$.

Distance-hereditary graphs. A graph G is *distance-hereditary* if for every connected induced subgraph H of G, the distance between u and v in H is the same as the distance between u and v in G. A graph is called a *DH obstruction* if it is isomorphic to a gem, a house, a domino or an induced cycle of length at least 5, that are depicted in Figure 1. A DH obstruction is *small* if it has at most 6 vertices.

Theorem 2.1. *Let G be a graph. The following are equivalent.*

- *G has rank-width at most* 1*.*
- *G is a distance-hereditary graph.*
- *G has no induced subgraph isomorphic to one of DH obstructions.*

For a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, we say that S is a *DH-modulator* if $G - S$ is distance-hereditary. A DH-modulator S is *good* if every DH obstruction of G contains at least two vertices of S, or equivalently, $G[(V(G) \setminus S) \cup \{v\}]$ is distance-hereditary for every $v \in S$.

The following lemma from [21] is useful.



FIGURE 2. An example of a split decomposition of a distance-hereditary graph. Dashed edges denote marked edges and each B_i denotes a bag.

Lemma 2.2. *Given a graph G, if P is an induced path in G of length at least 3 and $v \in V(G) \setminus V(P)$ is adjacent with the end vertices of P, then $G[V(P) \cup \{v\}]$ contains a DH obstruction including v.*

Split decompositions. We follow the notations in [3]. A *split* of a connected graph G is a vertex partition (A, B) of G such that $|A| \geq 2, |B| \geq 2$, and $N_G(B)$ is complete to $N_G(A)$. A connected graph G is called a *prime graph* if $|V(G)| \geq 5$ and it has no split. A connected graph D with a distinguished set of cut edges $M(D)$ of D is called a *marked graph* if $M(D)$ forms a matching. An edge in $M(D)$ is called a *marked edge*, and every other edge is called an *unmarked edge*. A vertex incident with a marked edge is called a *marked vertex*, and every other vertex is called an *unmarked vertex*. Each connected component of $D - M(D)$ is called a *bag* of D. See Figure 2 for an example.

When G admits a split (A, B), we construct a marked graph D on the vertex set $V(G) \cup \{a', b'\}$ such that

- $a'b'$ is a new marked edge,
- A is anti-complete to B,
- $\{a'\}$ is complete to $N_G(B)$, $\{b'\}$ is complete to $N_G(A)$, and
- for vertices a, b with $\{a, b\} \subseteq A$ or $\{a, b\} \subseteq B$, $ab \in E(G)$ if and only if $ab \in E(D)$.

The marked graph D is called a *simple decomposition of G*. A *split decomposition* of a connected graph G is a marked graph D defined inductively to be either G or a marked graph defined from a split decomposition D' of G by replacing a connected component H of $D' - M(D')$ with a simple decomposition of H. It is known that for two vertices u, v in G, $uv \in E(G)$ if and only if there is a path from u to v in D where its first and last edges are unmarked, and an unmarked edge and a marked edge alternatively appear in the path [1, Lemma 2.10]. For convenience, we call a bag a *star bag* or a *complete bag* if it is a star or a complete graph, respectively.

Naturally, we can define a reverse operation of decomposing into a simple decomposition; for a marked edge xy of a split decomposition D, *recomposing xy* is the operation of removing two vertices x and y and making $N_D(x) \setminus \{y\}$ complete to $N_D(y) \setminus \{x\}$ with unmarked edges. It is not hard to observe that if D is a split decomposition of G, then G can be obtained from D by recomposing all marked edges.

Note that there are many ways of decomposing a complete graph or a star, because every its non-trivial vertex partition is a split. Cunningham and Edmonds [7] developed a canonical way to decompose a graph into a split decomposition by not allowing to decompose a bag which is a star or a complete graph. A split decomposition D of G is called a *canonical split decomposition* if each bag of D is either a prime graph, a star, or

a complete graph, and D cannot be obtained from a split decomposition with the same property by recomposing a marked edge. Bouchet [3] observed that every canonical split decomposition has no marked edge linking two complete bags, and no marked edge linking a leaf of a star bag and the center of another star bag. Furthermore, for each pair of twins a, b in G, it holds that a, b must both be located in the same bag of the canonical split decomposition.

Theorem 2.3 (Cunningham and Edmonds [7])**.** *Every connected graph has a unique canonical split decomposition, up to isomorphism.*

Theorem 2.4 (Dahlhaus [8])**.** *The canonical split decomposition of a graph G can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|V(G)| + |E(G)|)$.*

We can now give the second characterization of distance-hereditary graphs that is crucial for our results. See Figure 2 for an example of their split decompositions.

Theorem 2.5 (Bouchet [3])**.** *A graph is a distance-hereditary graph if and only if every bag in its canonical split decomposition is either a star bag or a complete bag.*

3. Approximation algorithm

We present a polynomial-time algorithm which constructs an approximate DH-modulator of G provided that G contains no small DH obstructions and (G, k) is a Yes-instance for Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion. The main result is as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *There is a polynomial-time algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ which, given a graph G without a small DH obstuction and a positive integer k, either correctly reports that (G, k) is a* No*-instance to* Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion*, or returns a DH-modulator $S \subseteq V(G)$ of size $O(k^4)$.*

To begin with, we may assume that the instance (G, k) satisfies $n \leq 2^{ck}$ for some constant c. Recall that there is an algorithm for Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion running in time $2^{ck} \cdot poly(n)$ by Eiben, Ganian, and Kwon [9]. If $n > 2^{ck}$, then the algorithm of [9] solves the instance (G, k) correctly in polynomial time, in which case we can output a trivial equivalent instance.

A recent work of Jansen and Pilipczuk [20] for a polynomial kernel for Chordal Vertex Deletion employs an approximation algorithm as an important subroutine. We follow a similar vein of approach as in [20] here. The crux is to reduce the problem of finding an approximate DH-modulator to a restricted version where an input instance comes with a biclique DH-modulator (which we call a *controlled instance*). In this special case, finding an approximate DH-modulator boils down to solving Vertex Multicut. We construct an instance of Vertex Multicut using a feasible solution to the LP relaxation of Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion. To this end, we obtain a decomposition

$$V(G) = D \uplus K_\ell \uplus \cdots K_1 \uplus X_\ell \uplus \cdots X_1$$

where $G[D]$ is distance-hereditary, each K_i is a biclique, $|X_i| = O(k\sqrt{\log k})$ and $\ell = O(k^2)$, if (G, k) is a Yes-instance (Proposition 3.9). Such a decomposition is achieved by recursively extracting pairs (K, X) from G, where K is a biclique, X is a vertex set of size at most $O(k\sqrt{\log k})$ until the resulting graph after removing those sets is distance-hereditary. Then in the graph $G[D \uplus K_\ell \uplus \cdots K_1]$, we recursively find an approximate DH-modulator using the algorithm for a controlled instance.

As we consider distance-hereditary graphs instead of chordal graphs, our approximation algorithm makes some important deviations from [20]. First, we extract a pair containing a biclique, instead of a clique. Second, unlike in [20], we cannot guarantee that a long induced cycle traverses exactly one connected component of the distance-hereditary graph D. Such differences call for nontrivial tweaks in our approximation.

3.1. **LP relaxation and preprocessing.** Since G does not contain any small DH obstructions, the following is a linear program formulation of Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion for an instance (G, k):

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \sum_{v} x_v & & \\ s.t \quad & x(H) \geq 1 & & \forall H \text{ is an induced cycle of length at least } 7 \\ & x_v \geq 0 & & \forall v \in V(G) \end{aligned}$$

where $x(H) := \sum_{v \in V(H)} x_v$. It is clear that an optimal integral solution corresponds to an optimal DH-modulator and vice versa. We call a feasible solution to this LP a *feasible fractional solution* to Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion (for G).

The following observation is easy, but important.

Observation 3.2. *If x^* is a feasible fractional solution to* Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion *for a graph G, then for any induced subgraph G' of G, x^* restricted to $V(G')$ is a feasible fractional solution for G' as well.*

An optimal fractional solution x^* to Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion can be found in polynomial time using the ellipsoid method[1] provided that there is a separation oracle for detecting a violated constraint for a fractional solution x'. Such a separation oracle can be easily implemented in polynomial time.

Lemma 3.3. *Let G be a graph with non-negative weights $x' : V(G) \to \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$. For any positive integer d, one can decide in time $O(n^{d+2})$ whether there is an induced cycle H of length at least d with $x'(H) < \ell$.*

Proof. For every size-d vertex subset D of G such that $G[D]$ is an induced path, with s and t as end vertices, we solve a weighted shortest-path problem on G' with weights $x'|_{V(G')}$, where G' is obtained by removing all internal vertices of D and their neighbors, except for s and t. Clearly, D together with the obtained shortest (s, t)-path forms an induced cycle of length at least d. Conversely, if there is an induced cycle of length at least d, then it can be detected by considering all size-d vertex subsets. □

Let x^* be an optimal fractional solution to Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion for G and let $\tilde{X}$ be the set of all vertices v such that $x^*_v \geq \frac{1}{20}$. Observe

$$k \geq x^*(G) \geq \frac{1}{20} \cdot |\tilde{X}| + x^*(G - \tilde{X}) \tag{1}$$

From Inequality (1), it is easy to see that if $|\tilde{X}| > 20k$, then (G, k) is a No-instance. Therefore, we may assume that $|\tilde{X}| \leq 20k$. Furthermore, by Observation 3.2, x^* restricted to $V(G) \setminus \tilde{X}$ is a feasible fractional solution for $G - \tilde{X}$ and $x^*_v < \frac{1}{20}$ for every $v \in V(G) \setminus \tilde{X}$.

[1]We mention that for our LP relaxation, found optimal solution has all rational values, each being represented using polynomial number of digits in n.

We add $\tilde{X}$ to the approximate DH-modulator S we are constructing and remove $\tilde{X}$ from G. Henceforth, we assume that x^* is a feasible fractional solution to Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion for G such that $x^*_v < \frac{1}{20}$ for every $v \in V(G)$. Clearly, $|x^*| \leq k$.

3.2. **Decomposition into DH and bicliques.** Using the following observations, we decompose the vertex set of G into bicliques, a set inducing a distance-hereditary graph, and a bounded number of extra vertices.

We first prove an $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ bound on the number of maximal bicliques in a graph having no small DH obstructions. This can be seen as an extension of an $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ bound on the number of maximal cliques in graphs without C_4 [11, Proposition 2] or an $\mathcal{O}(n\sqrt{n})$ bound for graphs without C_4 and the diamond [10, Theorem 2.1]. The tightness of the latter result was also confirmed. We say two sets A and B *cross* if $A \setminus B \neq \emptyset$, $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$, and $B \setminus A \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let A be a set and let $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \ldots, C_m\}$ be a family of subsets of A such that for each distinct integers $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, $C_i \neq C_j$ and C_i and C_j do not cross. Then $m \leq \frac{|A|(|A|+1)}{2}$.*

Proof. We may assume $|A| \geq 2$. Let $v \in A$. Note that the sets in $\mathcal{C}$ containing v can be ordered linearly by the inclusion relation. Therefore, there are at most $|A|$ sets containing v. By induction $\{C_i \in \mathcal{C} : v \notin C_i\}$ contains at most $\frac{(|A|-1)|A|}{2}$ elements. Thus, in total, $|\mathcal{C}| \leq \frac{|A|(|A|+1)}{2}$. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let G be a graph on n vertices that has no small DH obstructions. Then G contains at most $\frac{n^3+5n}{6}$ maximal bicliques, and they can be enumerated in polynomial time.*

Proof. We claim that every vertex is contained at most $\frac{(n-1)n}{2}+1$ maximal bicliques of G. Then by recursively enumerating all maximal bicliques containing v of G and discarding v from G, we obtain the bound $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(\frac{(i-1)i}{2} + 1 \right) \leq \frac{n^3+5n}{6}$ on the number of maximal bicliques in total.

Let $v \in V(G)$, and let $N_1 := N_G(v)$ and let N_2 be the set of vertices in $G-(\{v\} \cup N_G(v))$ that have a neighbor in N_1. We claim that for $w, z \in N_2$, $N_G(w) \cap N_1$ and $N_G(z) \cap N_1$ do not cross. Suppose for contradiction that there exists $w, z \in N_2$ where $N_G(w) \cap N_1$ and $N_G(z) \cap N_1$ cross. By definition, there exists $a_1 \in (N_G(w) \setminus N_G(z)) \cap N_1$, $a_2 \in (N_G(w) \cap N_G(z)) \cap N_1$, and $a_3 \in (N_G(z) \setminus N_G(w)) \cap N_1$. If $wz \in E(G)$, then regardless of the adjacency between a_1 and a_3, $G[\{w, z, a_1, a_3, v\}]$ is isomorphic to C_5 or the house. We may assume $wz \notin E(G)$. If $a_1a_3 \in E(G)$, then $G[\{w, z, a_1, a_2, a_3\}]$ is isomorphic to C_5, the house, or the gem. If $a_1a_3 \notin E(G)$, then $G[\{v, w, z, a_1, a_2, a_3\}]$ contains an induced subgraph isomorphic to the domino, the house, or the gem. Therefore, we can always find a small DH obstruction. We conclude that for $w, z \in N_2$, $N_G(w) \cap N_1$ and $N_G(z) \cap N_1$ do not cross, as G has no small DH obstructions.

So, $\{N_G(v) \cap N_1 : v \in N_2\}$ forms a family of sets such that any two sets do not cross. Since $|N_1| \leq |V(G)| - 1$, by Lemma 3.4, it contains at most $\frac{(n-1)n}{2}$ sets.

Notice that every biclique containing v and a vertex in N_2 should consists of one part with the union of v and a set of vertices in N_2 having the same neighbors on N_1. Thus, the number of such bicliques is at most $\frac{(n-1)n}{2}$. With the maximal biclique containing the trivial biclique with the partitions $\{v\}$ and N_1, there are at most $\frac{(n-1)n}{2} + 1$ bicliques

containing v, as required. Furthermore, by classfying the classes of vertices in N_2 having the same neighborhoods in N_1, we can enumerate all bicliques in polynomial time. □

One main observation is that every connected distance-hereditary graph admits a biclique that is also a balanced vertex separator. We prove this.

Lemma 3.6. *Let G be a connected distance-hereditary graph on at least two vertices. Then G contains a blicique that is a balanced vertex separator of G.*

Proof. Let D be a canonical split decomposition of G. If D consists of a single bag B, then $B = G$. Note that B is either a star or a complete graph on at least two vertices. In this case, we take the whole vertex set $V(G)$ as a balanced vertex separator of G. Henceforth, we can assume that D contains at least two bags.

For every marked edge $e = xy$ of D, let $U_x(e)$ (respectively, $U_y(e)$) denote the set of unmarked vertices contained in the connected component of $D - e$ containing x (respectively, y). Recall that $(U_x(e), U_y(e))$ defines a split of $V(G)$. Let $R_x(e) := N_G(U_y(e))$ and $R_y(e) := N_G(U_x(e))$. We note that a vertex v belongs to $R_y(e)$ if and only if v is an unmarked vertex in D that is connected to y by an odd-length path in $D - e$ alternating in marked edges and unmarked edges. Since $(U_x(e), U_y(e))$ is a split, the vertex set K_e defined as $R_x(e) \cup R_y(e)$ forms a biclique.

Let $\vec{D}$ be a graph obtained by orienting every marked edge $e = xy$ from x to y whenever $G[U_y(e) \setminus R_y(e)]$ contains a connected component of size larger than $\frac{1}{2}n$. Note that a connected component of $G[U_y(e) \setminus R_y(e)]$ is a connected component of $G - K_e$. If there is an unoriented edge $e = xy$ in $\vec{D}$, $K := K_e$ is a desired biclique that is a balanced vertex separator. Hence we assume that every marked edge is oriented in $\vec{D}$. Since every bag of $\vec{D}$ can have at most one marked edge oriented outward, there exists a bag B such that all incident marked edges are oriented toward B in $\vec{D}$.

Consider the case when B is a leaf bag, $e = xy$ is the unique marked edge incident with B oriented from x to y, and $y \in V(B)$. If B is a complete bag or a star bag in which y is the center, clearly all unmarked vertices of B belong to $R_y(e)$, and thus $U_y(e) \setminus R_y(e) = \emptyset$, contradicting the orientation of e. If B is a star bag in which y is a leaf, the (unmarked) center of B belongs to $R_y(e)$. Observe that each unmarked leaf vertex of B forms a trivial connected component of $G[U_y(e) \setminus R_y(e)]$, contradicting the orientation of e.

Hence B is incident with at least two marked edges, say $e_i = x_i y_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, where $y_i \in V(B)$ for every i. Let U_B be the set of unmarked vertices in B. We argue that B is a star bag with its center unmarked.

(a) *B is a complete bag:* Observe that for every i, $R_{y_i}(e_i) = \bigcup_{j \neq i} R_{x_j}(e_j) \cup U_B$. This means $K_{e_i} = R_{x_i}(e_i) \cup R_{y_i}(e_i) = \bigcup_j R_{x_j}(e_j) \cup B$, that is, K_{e_i} is the same for every i. Moreover, we have $U_B \subseteq K_{e_i}$. This means that each connected component of $G - K_{e_i}$ of size strictly less than $\frac{1}{2}n$, contradicting the orientations.

(b) *B is a star bag with its center marked:* Notice that the center of B is one of y_i's, say y_1. The orientation of e_1 implies that $G[U_{y_1}(e_1) \setminus R_{y_1}(e_1)]$ has a connected component C containing at least $\frac{1}{2}n$ vertices. On the other hand, all vertices of U_B and $R_{x_i}(e_i)$ for $i \neq 1$ have an odd-length path in $D - e_1$ to y_1 alternating in marked and unmarked edges, implying that $U_B \cup \bigcup_{i \neq 1} R_{x_i}(e_i) \subseteq R_{y_1}(e_1)$. Therefore, C is contained in a connected component of $G[U_{x_j}(e_j) \setminus R_{x_j}(e_j)]$ for some $j \neq 1$. This contradicts the orientation of e_j.

Hence, B is a star bag with its center unmarked. Let v be the center of B and observe that for every i, v is the only vertex in $B_{y_i}(e_i)$. Observe that $K := \{v\} \cup \bigcup_i R_{x_i}(e_i)$ is a biclique with the desired property. This completes the proof. □

The following result is from [12].

Theorem 3.7 (Feige, Hajiaghayi, and Lee [12])**.** *There is an $O(\sqrt{\log \mathsf{opt}})$-approximation algorithm for finding a balanced vertex separator.*

Lemma 3.8. *Let (G, k) be an instance to* Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion *such that G is connected and contains no small DH obstructions. There is a polynomial-time algorithm which finds a balanced vertex separator $K \uplus X$ such that*

- *K is a biclique or an empty set,*
- *and $|X| = O(k\sqrt{\log k})$*

whenever (G, k) is a Yes*-intance.*

Proof. We perform the following algorithm. Let K be a maximal biclique of G or an empty set. If every connected component of $G - K$ contains at most $\frac{2}{3}n$ vertices, we take $X := \emptyset$. Otherwise, we apply Theorem 3.7 to a (unique) largest connected component C of $G - K$ to find a balanced vertex separator X of C of size $O(\mathsf{opt}\sqrt{\log \mathsf{opt}})$. In both cases, if X is of size at most $O(k\sqrt{\log k})$, then $K \uplus X$ is clearly a desired balanced vertex separator. If no balanced vertex separator of size at most $O(k\sqrt{\log k})$ is found while iterating over all maximal bicliques of G and an empty set as K, then we report that there is no DH-modulator of size at most k. This algorithm runs in polynomial time since a balanced vertex separator X of a connected component C can be found in polynomial time by Theorem 3.7, and Lemma 3.5 provides an efficient way to iterate over all maximal bicliques.

To see the correctness, suppose that (G, k) is a Yes-instance and let X_0 be an optimal DH-modulator. If $G - X_0$ forms an independent set, then X_0 is a balanced vertex separator of $G - K$, where $K := \emptyset$. Therefore, the approximation algorithm of Theorem 3.7 will indeed find $O(k\sqrt{\log k})$-size balanced vertex separator when the above algorithm considers $K = \emptyset$.

Suppose this is not the case, and let C be a largest connected component of $G - X_0$. By Lemma 3.6, there is a balanced vertex separator K_0 of C which is a biclique. Let K be a maximal biclique in G with $K_0 \subseteq K$. Since each connected component of $G - X_0 - K_0$, and thus of $G - X_0 - K$, contains at most $\frac{2}{3}|C| \leq \frac{2}{3}n$ vertices, $X_0 \cup K$ is a balanced vertex separator of G. Let C' be any largest connected component of $G - K$. If C' contains at most $\frac{2}{3}n$ vertices, then the above algorithm will set $X := \emptyset$. If not, observe that $(X_0 \setminus K) \cap C'$ is a balanced vertex separator of C' whose size is at most k. Hence, the above algorithm applies the approximation algorithm of Theorem 3.7 to C', and finds $O(k\sqrt{\log k})$-size balanced vertex separator X' of C'. Notice that each connected component of $G - K - X'$ has size at most $\max\{\frac{1}{3}n, \frac{2}{3}|C'|\} \leq \frac{2}{3}n$. This completes the proof. □

For an instance (G, k) such that G does not contain any small DH obstructions, let $K_1 \uplus X_1$ be a balanced vertex separator obtained by applying Lemma 3.8 to a connected component of G that is not distance-hereditary. Notice that $K_1 \uplus X_1$ is not necessarily a DH-modulator and there may be a connected component of $G - (K_1 \uplus X_1)$ which is not distance-hereditary. At i-th recursive step, we apply Lemma 3.8 to a connected component G_i of $G - \bigcup_{j<i}(K_j \uplus X_j)$ which is not distance-hereditary and obtain a balanced vertex

separator $K_i \uplus X_i$ of G_i. If the algorithm of Lemma 3.8 reports that (G_i, k) is a No-instance for some i, then indeed (G, k) is a No-instance. Otherwise, we obtain a decomposition

$$V(G) = D \uplus K_\ell \uplus \cdots K_1 \uplus X_\ell \uplus \cdots X_1,$$

where $G[D]$ is distance-hereditary, each K_i is a biclique or an empty set, and $|X_i| = O(k\sqrt{\log k})$.

The recursive applications of Lemma 3.8 can be represented as a branching tree $\mathcal{T}$, where the roots corresponding to the initial connected components (that are not distance-hereditary), and the leaves correspond to the connected components of D. The subtree of $\mathcal{T}$ after removing the leaf nodes can have at most k leaves; otherwise, we have $k+1$ disjoint induced subgraphs of G each of which are not distance-hereditary. The maximum length of a root-to-leaf path in $\mathcal{T}$ is at most $O(\log n)$. Hence, we have a bound $\ell = O(k \log n) = O(k^2)$ as $n \leq 2^{ck}$ for some constant c. This implies $\bigcup_{i \leq \ell} X_i$ has at most $O(k^3\sqrt{\log k})$ vertices. We add them to a DH-modulator S under construction and remove from G.

We summarize the result of this subsection.

Proposition 3.9. *Let (G, k) be an instance to* Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion *such that G contains no small DH obstructions. There is a polynomial-time algorithm which, given such (G, k), either computes a decomposition*

$$V(G) = D \uplus K_\ell \uplus \cdots K_1 \uplus X$$

such that $G[D]$ is distance-hereditary, each K_i is a biclique, $|X| = O(k^3\sqrt{\log k})$ and $\ell = O(k^2)$, or correctly reports that (G, k) is a No*-instance.*

3.3. **Handling a controlled instance.** A graph G is said to be *controlled* if G contains no small DH obstructions and $V(G)$ is partitioned into $D \uplus K$ such that $G[D]$ is distance-hereditary and K is a biclique. We fix such a partition $D \uplus K$ for a given controlled instance under consideration. Also we fix a bipartition $A \uplus B$ for the given biclique K such that $ab \in E(G)$ for every $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. In this part, it is important that both A and B are non-empty by the definition of a biclique.

The next lemma is useful.

Lemma 3.10. *Let G be a controlled graph. For an induced cycle H of length at least 7, let ℓ be the number of connected components in $G[V(H) \cap K]$. Then the followings hold.*

(a) If $\ell = 1$, then both $G[V(H) \cap K]$ and $H - K$ are paths, and $|V(H) \cap K| \leq 3$.
(b) If $\ell \geq 2$, there exists a subpath P of H such that P is a K-path, and the length of P is at least 3.

Proof. If $\ell = 1$, clearly both $G[V(H) \cap K]$ and $H - K$ are (induced) paths. Suppose $|V(H) \cap K| \geq 4$, and note that $V(H) \cap K$ are contained in either A or B, say A. Then $G[(V(H) \cap K) \cup \{b\}]$ induces a gem for any $b \in B$ since $G[V(H) \cap K]$ is an induced path. This contradicts that G does not contain any small DH obstructions. It follows $|V(H) \cap K| \leq 3$.

Suppose $\ell \geq 2$. There exists two K-paths on H, say P_1 and P_2, each containing at least one internal vertex and occuring on H consecutively. (Recall that an S-path is a path whose end vertices are in S and all of whose internal vertices lie outside S.) We note that the end vertices of both P_1 and P_2 are contained in either A or B, say A; otherwise H contains a chord. To prove (b), it suffices to show that one of P_1 and P_2 is of length at least three. Obviously, we have $|V(P_i)| \geq 3$ for $i = 1, 2$. Suppose that $|V(P_1)| = |V(P_2)| = 3$.

Let Q be a component of $G[V(H) \cap K]$ that intersects with both P_1 and P_2 (possibly Q consists of a single vertex). Pick an arbitrary vertex $b \in B$; such b exists for $B \neq \emptyset$. If $|V(Q)| = 1$, observe that $G[V(P_1) \cup V(P_2) \cup \{b\}]$ induces a gem, a house or a domino, a contradiction. If $|V(Q)| \geq 2$, then $G[V(P_1) \cup V(Q) \cup \{b\}]$ contains a gem or a house, a contradiction. This establishes (b). □

Lemma 3.11. *Let G be a controlled graph. If x^* is a fractional solution to* Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion *for G such that $x^*_v < \frac{1}{20}$ for every vertex v of G, then x' defined as*

$$x'_v = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v \in K \\ 2x^*_v & \text{if } v \in D \end{cases}$$

is also a feasible fractional solution.

Proof. Consider an arbitrary induced cycle H of length at least 7. We only need to verify that $x'(H) \geq 1$. There are two possibilities.

Suppose $G[V(H) \cap K]$ contains exactly one connected component. By Lemma 3.10, we have $|V(H) \cap K| \leq 3$. By assumption, we have $\sum_{v \in V(H) \cap K} x^*_v < 3 \cdot \frac{1}{20} < \frac{1}{2}$, and thus $\sum_{v \in V(H) \cap D} x^*_v \geq \frac{1}{2}$. It follows that

$$\sum_{v \in V(H)} x'_v = \sum_{v \in V(H) \cap D} x'_v = \sum_{v \in V(H) \cap D} 2x^*_v \geq 1.$$

If $G[V(H) \cap K]$ contains at least two connected components, by Lemma 3.10, H contains a K-path P of length at least 3 as a subpath. Recall that $V(H) \cap K$ are contained in either A or B, say A. Hence, for any $b \in B$, $G[\{b\} \cup V(P)]$ contains an induced cycle H' of length at least 7 by Lemma 2.2. Note that $G[V(H') \cap K]$ has exactly one connected component and thus $x'(H) \geq 1$. Since $x'_b = 0$, we have

$$\sum_{v \in V(H)} x'_v \geq \sum_{v \in V(P)} x'_v \geq \sum_{v \in V(H')} x'_v \geq 1.$$ □

We mention that the feasible fractional solution x' obtained as in Lemma 3.11 meets $|x'| \leq 2|x^*|$ and for every vertex v of G, we have $x'_v < \frac{1}{10}$.

An instance of Vertex Multicut consists of an undirected graph G and a set $\mathcal{T}$ of (unordered) vertex pairs of G. The goal is to find a minimum-size set $X \subseteq V(G)$ that hits every path from s to t for every $(s,t) \in \mathcal{T}$. Notice that we are allowed to delete a terminal. An LP formulation of $(G, \mathcal{T})$ of Vertex Multicut is the same as the above LP of Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion, except that we replace the constraints on induced cycles of length at least 7 by

$$x(P) \geq 1$$

for every (s,t)-path P with $(s,t) \in \mathcal{T}$. The following result from [17] is originally stated for Directed Multicut, where we want to find a minimum set of arcs to hit all directed (s,t)-path for every (ordered) terminal pairs. Using standard reductions, one can reduce the undirected version of Vertex Multicut to Directed Vertex Multicut, which again can be reduced to Directed Multicut. Moreover, these reductions preserve the objective values of both the integral solutions and feasible fractional solutions.

Theorem 3.12 (Gupta [17]). *Let x' be a feasible fractional solution to a* Vertex Multicut *instance $(G, \mathcal{T})$. There exists a constant c such that, in polynomial time, one can find an integral solution to* Vertex Multicut *of size at most $c \cdot |x'|^2$.*

Lemma 3.13. *Let G be a controlled graph and let x' be a feasible fractional solution to* Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion *such that $x'_v < \frac{1}{10}$ for all $v \in D$ and $x'_v = 0$ for all $v \in K$. There is a polynomial-time algorithm which, given such (G, k) and x', returns a DH-modulator X of size $O(|x'|^2)$.*

Proof. For each induced subgraph H of G, let $x'(H) := \sum_{v \in V(H)} x'_v$. We construct an instance $(G[D], \mathcal{T})$ of Vertex Multicut with terminal pairs $\mathcal{T} := \{(s,t) \subseteq D \times D : \mathrm{dist}_{G[D],x'}(s,t) \geq 1\}$, where $\mathrm{dist}_{G[D],x'}(s,t)$ is the minimum $x'(P)$ over all (s,t)-paths P. Notice that for every terminal pair $(s,t) \in \mathcal{T}$, and for every (s,t)-path P in $G[D]$, we have

$$x'(P) \geq \mathrm{dist}_{G[D],x'}(s,t) \geq 1,$$

meaning that x' is a feasible fractional solution to Vertex Multicut for the instance $(G[D], \mathcal{T})$. By Theorem 3.12, we can obtain a vertex set $X \subseteq D$ of size $O(|x'|^2)$ such that $G[D \setminus X]$ contains no (s,t)-path for every terminal pair $(s,t) \in \mathcal{T}$ in polynomial time.

It is sufficient to show that $G - X$ is distance-hereditary. For the sake of contradiction, suppose $G - X$ contains an induced cycle H of length at least 7, and we specifically choose H so as to minimize

$$\text{the number of connected components in } G[V(H) \cap K]$$

Claim 1. *$G[V(H) \cap K]$ has exactly one connected component and $|V(H) \cap K| \leq 3$.*

Proof of the Claim: Suppose $G[V(H) \cap K]$ has at least two connected components. Observe that $V(H) \cap K$ is entirely contained either in A or B, say A. By Lemma 3.10, there exists a subpath P of H that is a K-path and having length at least 3. Choose any vertex $b \in B$ and observe that $G[V(P) \cup \{b\}]$ contains a DH obstruction H' by Lemma 2.2. Especially, H' must be an induced cycle of length at least 7 since G does not contain any small DH obstructions. For $B \cap X = \emptyset$, H' is an induced cycle in $G - X$ having strictly less connected components in $G[V(H') \cap K]$, contradicting the choice of H. This proves the first part of the statement. The second part follows from Lemma 3.10. ◊

By Claim 1, $H - K$ is an induced path P contained in a connected component of $G[D]$. Let s and t be the end vertices of P and notice that $(s,t) \notin \mathcal{T}$ since P contains no vertex of X. Hence, $G[D]$ contains an induced (s,t)-path W such that $x'(W) < 1$. Since x' is a feasible fractional solution to Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion, we have $x'(P) \geq x'(H) \geq 1$. Therefore, P contains at least 11 vertices since $x'_v < \frac{1}{10}$ for every $v \in D$ and $x'_v = 0$ for every $v \in K$. Since $G[D]$ is distance-hereditary and W is induced, we have $|V(W)| = |V(P)| \geq 11$. Let $w_1 (= s), w_1, \ldots, w_p (= t)$ be the vertices of W in the order of their occurrence on W where $p \geq 11$.

Now we argue that $G[V(W) \cup (V(H) \cap K)]$ contains a DH obstruction.

Claim 2. *$G[V(W) \cup (V(H) \cap K)]$ contains an induced cycle of length at least 7.*

Proof of the Claim: If $|V(H) \cap K| = 1$, this follows from Lemma 2.2. So, we may assume that $2 \leq |V(H) \cap K| \leq 3$. Let v_1, v_2 be vertices of $V(H) \cap K$ that are adjacent with $s = w_1$ and $t = w_p$, respectively.

We want to argue that for each $i = 1, 2$, either $G[V(W) \cup \{v_i\}]$ contains an induced cycle of length at least 7, or v_i is not adjacent with any of $w_4, \ldots, w_8$. If v_i is adjacent with any of w_j with $j \geq 4$, then Lemma 2.2 applies and we have a DH obstruction. Such an obstruction can only be an induced cycle of length at least 7 as we assume that G does not contain a small DH obstruction. Hence, we may assume that v_1 is not adjacent with any of $w_4, \ldots, w_\ell$. A symmetric argument also holds for v_2.

Therefore, we may assume that each of v_1 and v_2 are not adjacent with any of $w_4, \ldots, w_8$. It remains to observe that $G[\{v_1, v_2\} \cup V(W)]$ contains an induced cycle of length at least 7. If v_1 and v_2 are the only vertices of $V(H) \cap K$, then $v_1v_2 \in E(G)$ and thus $G[\{v_1, v_2\} \cup \{w_4, \ldots, w_8\}]$ forms an induced cycle of length at least 7. If there is another vertex in $V(H) \cap K$, observe that the remaining vertex, say v_3, is adjacent to v_1 and v_2 and $G[\{v_1, w_4, \ldots, w_8, v_2\}]$ forms an induced cycle. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a DH obstruction in $G[\{v_1, w_4, \ldots, w_8, v_2\}] \cup \{v_3\}$, which can only be an induced cycle of length at least 7. ◊

Let $\tilde{H}$ be such an induced cycle of length at least 7 as stated in Claim 2. That $V(\tilde{H}) \subseteq V(W) \cup (V(H) \cap K)$ and $x'(V(H) \cap K) = 0$ implies $x'(\tilde{H}) \leq x'(W) < 1$. This contradicts the assumption that x' is a feasible fractional solution to Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion. This concludes the proof that $G - X$ is distance-hereditary. □

One can easily obtain the main result of this subsection.

Proposition 3.14. *Let G be a controlled graph and x^* be a feasible fractional solution to* Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion *such that $x^*_v < \frac{1}{20}$ for every $v \in V(G)$. There is a polynomial-time algorithm which, given such G and x^*, finds a DH-modulator X of size at most $O(|x^*|^2)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.11, we can obtain a feasible fractional solution x' to Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion such that $x'_v = 0$ for every $v \in K$, $x'_v < \frac{1}{10}$ for every $v \in D$ and $|x'| \leq 2|x^*|$. Such x' meets the condition of Lemma 3.13, and we can obtain a DH-modulator X of G such that $|X| = O(|x'|^2) = O(|x^*|^2)$ in polynomial time. □

3.4. **Proof of Theorem 3.1.** We present a proof of Theorem 3.1. Let (G, k) be an instance of Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion such that G does not contain any small DH obstructions. Let x^* be an optimal fractional solution to Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion for G. We may assume that $|x^*| \leq k$, otherwise we immediately report that (G, k) is a No-instance. Let $\tilde{X}$ be the set of all vertices v such that $x^*_v \geq \frac{1}{20}$. Observe that $|\tilde{X}| \leq 20k$ since otherwise, $|x^*| \geq \frac{1}{20} \cdot |\tilde{X}| > k$, a contradiction. Also x^* restricted to $V(G) \setminus \tilde{X}$ is a fractional feasible solution to Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion for $G - \tilde{X}$ such that $x^*_v < \frac{1}{20}$ for every v.

We compute a decomposition $V(G - \tilde{X}) = D \uplus \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} K_i \cup X$ as in Proposition 3.9, or correctly report (G, k) as a No-instance. Recall that $\ell = O(k^2)$ and $|X| = O(k^3\sqrt{\log k})$. Note that $V(G - (\tilde{X} \cup X)) = D \uplus \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} K_i$. From $i = 1$ up to ℓ, we want to obtain a DH-modulator S_i of G_i, where $G_1 := G[D \cup K_1]$ and for $i = 2, \ldots, \ell$, G_i is the subgraph of G induced by $(V(G_{i-1}) \setminus S_{i-1}) \cup K_i$. Notice that for every $i = 1, \ldots, \ell - 1$, if $G_i - S_i$ is distance-hereditary, then G_{i+1} is a controlled graph. For $i = 1$, clearly G_1 is a controlled graph. Hence, we can inductively apply the algorithm of Proposition 3.14 and obtain a DH-modulator S_i of size at most $O(|x^*|^2)$ of G_i. Especially, $G_\ell - S_\ell$ is distance-hereditary,

implying that the set defined as

$$S := \tilde{X} \cup X \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} S_i$$

is a DH-modulator of G. From $|x^*| \leq k$, we have $|S_i| = O(k^2)$. It follows that $|S| = O(k^4)$.

4. Twin Reduction Rule

We introduce a reduction rule that bounds the size of a set of pairwise twins in $G-S$ by a polynomial function in k, where S is a DH-modulator obtained by Theorem 3.1. Note that in the FPT algorithm obtained by Eiben, Ganian, and Kwon [9], there is a similar rule which reduces the size of a twin set outside of a DH-modulator, but that assume the given instance has no small DH obstructions. For our kernelization algorithm, we cannot assume that the given instance has no small DH obstructions. Therefore, we need to analyze more carefully.

Let $W \subseteq V(G) \setminus S$ be a set of vertices that are pairwise twins in $G - S$. A vertex of W may have an arbitrary adjacency with the vertices of S. Therefore, the family of subsets of W each of which forms a twin set in G can be exponentially large in $|S|$. The underlying observation of our reduction rule is that it suffices to keep up to $k+1$ vertices for each subset of W that are pairwise twins with respect to a small number of vertices in S.

For a subset $S' \subseteq S$, we say that $u, v \in V(G) \setminus S$ are *S'-twins* if u and v are twins in $G[(V(G) \setminus S) \cup S']$. A vertex set $Z \subseteq V(G) \setminus S$ is an *S'-twin set* if it consists of pairwise S'-twins. Note that if Z is already a twin set in $G - S$, then Z forms a S'-twin set if and only if any two vertices of Z have the same neighborhood in S'. Each vertex of Z can have at most $2^{|S'|}$ possible adjacency relations with S' and hence, each S' partitions W into at most $2^{|S'|}$ S'-twins. We introduce the following reduction rule.

Reduction Rule 1. Let S be a DH-modulator of a graph G, and let W be a set of pairwise twins in $G - S$. Let $m := \min(|S|, 4)$. Over all $S' \subseteq S$ of size m, we do the followings: mark up to $k+1$ vertices, that are unmarked yet, in each S'-twin set of W. If there is an unmarked vertex v of W after finishing the marking procedure, we remove v from G.

Clearly, we can apply Reduction Rule 1 exhaustively in polynomial time by considering all twin sets of $G - S$, and for each twin set going through all subsets S' of S of size 4. It is easy to see that the size of a twin set W after applying Reduction Rule 1 is bounded by a polynomial function in k and $|S|$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $S \subseteq V(G)$ be a DH-modulator, and W be a twin set in $G - S$, and let $m := \min(|S|, 4)$. If (G, k) is irreducible with respect to Reduction Rule 1 on S and W, then we have $|W| \leq 16 \cdot \binom{|S|}{m} \cdot (k+1) = \mathcal{O}(k|S|^4)$.*

Proof. First assume that $|S| \geq 4$. There are at most $\binom{|S|}{4}$ different choices of S', and for each S' we mark up to $2^4 \cdot (k+1)$ vertices of W. Therefore, if $|W| > 16 \cdot \binom{|S|}{4} \cdot (k+1)$, the set W can be reduced further by removing a vertex.

Assume that $|S| \leq 3$. Then we mark up to $2^{|S|} \cdot (k+1) \leq 8(k+1)$ vertices of W. Thus, if $|W| > 8(k+1)$, then the set W can be reduced further by removing a vertex. □

Lemma 4.2. *Reduction Rule 1 is safe*

Proof. Suppose $v \in W$ is an unmarked vertex. We show that (G, k) is a YES-instance if and only if $(G - v, k)$ is a YES-instance. The forward direction is clear. Suppose that $G - v$ has a solution T with $|T| \leq k$ and that $G - T$ contains a DH obstruction F as an induced subgraph. Clearly, $v \in V(F)$.

First, suppose that F is a small DH obstruction. Let $S' := V(F) \cap S$ and observe that $|S'| \leq 5$. We divide cases depending on whether $|S'| \leq 4$ or $|S'| = 5$.

Case 1. $|S'| \leq 4$**.**

In this case, we choose any set $S'' \subseteq S$ containing S' where $|S''| = \min\{4, |S|\}$. Since v is unmarked, there are $k + 1$ (marked) vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}$ of W each of which are S''-twins with v. We claim that for every v_i with $1 \leq i \leq k + 1$ and every $w \in V(F) \setminus \{v, v_i\}$, $wv \in E(G)$ if and only if $wv_i \in E(G)$. If $w \notin S$, obviously $wv \in E(G)$ if and only if $wv_i \in E(G)$ since v and v_i are twins in $G - S$. If $w \in S$, then $w \in S''$ and the fact that v and v_i are S''-twins leads to the same conclusion.

In particular, this implies that none of $v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}$ belongs to $V(F)$ since no two vertices of a (minimal) DH obstruction are twins. Therefore, due to $|T| \leq k$, we can choose a vertex v' among $v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}$ such that $v' \notin T \cup V(F)$. Due to the aformentioned claim, $G[(V(F) \setminus v) \cup \{v'\}]$ is isomorphic to F, contradicting that $(G-v)-T$ is distance-hereditary.

Case 2. $|S'| = 5$**.**

In this case, F is isomorphic to the domino, and $V(F) \setminus \{v\} \subseteq S$. If v is a vertex of degree 2 in F, then let v' be the vertex of degree 3 that is not adjacent to v. If v is a vertex of degree 3 in F, then we choose a vertex v' of degree 2 that is not adjacent to v. We can observe that the graph obtained from F by adding vv' contains the house. Thus, we can ignore the adjacency between v and v' when we obtain a DH obstruction by replacing v with other vertex in W.

Let $S' := V(F) \setminus \{v, v'\}$. Since v is unmarked, there are $k + 1$ (marked) vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}$ of W each of which are S'-twins with v. Since $V(H) \setminus \{v\} \subseteq S$, none of $v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}$ belongs to $V(F)$. Therefore, due to $|T| \leq k$, we can choose a vertex v' among $v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}$ such that $v' \notin T \cup V(F)$. By the above observation, either $G[(V(F) \setminus v) \cup \{v'\}]$ is isomorphic to the domino or it contains the house, contradicting that $(G - v) - T$ is distance-hereditary.

Secondly, consider the case when F is an induced cycle of length at least 5. Let u and w be two neighbors of v in F. It suffices to prove there exists $v' \in (W \setminus V(F)) \setminus T$ such that $uv', wv' \in E(G)$. Indeed, this implies that $G[(V(F) \setminus v) \cup \{v'\}]$ contains a DH obstruction by Lemma 2.2, contradicting that $(G - v) - T$ is distance-hereditary.

Let $S' := S \cap \{u, w\}$, which is possibly $\emptyset$. We choose any set $S'' \subseteq S$ containing S' where $|S''| = \min\{4, |S|\}$. Let $v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}$ be $k + 1$ (marked) vertices of W each of which are S''-twins with v. We claim that none of $v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}$ belong to F. Suppose $v_i \in V(F)$ for some i. Since $u, w \in S'' \cup N[W]$ and v, v_i are S''-twins, $\{v, u, w, v_i\}$ forms a cycle of length 4 (possibly with a chord). This contradicts that F an induced cycle of length at least 5, and the claim follows. From this claim and $|T| \leq k$, we know that there exists $v' \in (W \setminus V(F)) \setminus T$ among $v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}$, and thus $uv', wv' \in E(G)$. This complete the proof. □

We remark that the value 4 in Reduction Rule 1 is possible because of the careful analysis on the domino in **Case 2** of Lemma 4.2. We observe that this cannot be further reduced to 3. Let v be the vertex of degree 2 in the house H whose neighbors are adjacent.

If some new vertex v' is not adjacent to one of the neighbors of v in H, then we cannot guarantee that $H[V(H) \setminus \{v\} \cup \{v'\}]$ contains a DH obstruction. Also, if some new vertex v' is adjacent to one of the non-neighbors of v in H, then we cannot guarantee that $H[V(H) \setminus \{v\} \cup \{v'\}]$ contains a DH obstruction. Therefore, to create a new obstruction by replacing v with some other vertex v', we should care about the adjacency between v' and all vertices in $V(H) \setminus \{v\}$, which have size 4.

5. Bounding the number of connected components of $G - S$

In this section, we provide a reduction rule that bounds the number of non-trivial connected components of $G - S$, where S is a *good DH-modulator*, which will be provided in Section 7. Recall that a DH-modulator S is good if for every $v \in S$ and every connected component C of $G - S$, $G[V(C) \cup \{v\}]$ is also distance-hereditary.

Let (G, k) be an instance, and let S be a good DH-modulator. For each pair of $v \in S$ and a connected component C of $G-S$, let $N(v, C) := N_G(v) \cap V(C)$. We say that a connected component of $G - S$ is *trivial* if it consists of a single vertex, and *non-trivial* otherwise. Note that for a non-trivial connected component C of $G - S$, $(V(C), V(G) \setminus V(C))$ is *not* a split (or simply *non-split*) if and only if there exists a pair of vertices $v, w \in S$ such that $N(v, C) \neq \emptyset$, $N(w, C) \neq \emptyset$ and $N(v, C) \neq N(w, C)$. Such a pair $v, w \in S$ is said to *witness* that $(V(C), V(G) \setminus V(C))$ is a non-split, or simply a witnessing pair for C. Notice that a non-split may have more than one witnessing pair.

Reduction Rule 2. Over all non-trivial connected components C of $G - S$, we do the followings iteratively:

(1) If $(V(C), V(G) \setminus V(C))$ is a split, then remove all edges in C.
(2) Otherwise, add 1 to a counter (up to $k + 2$) on a pair $v, w \in S$ witnessing that $(V(C), V(G) \setminus V(C))$ is a non-split. If the counters of all witnessing pairs for C are $k + 2$, then we remove all edges in C.

Here, the counter for every pair of vertices in S is set to zero at the beginnng.

To prove the soundness of (2) of Reduction Rule 2, we first show that there is a DH obstruction whenever there are two connected components C_i and C_j of $G - S$ each of which forms a non-split with $V(G) \setminus V(C_i)$ and $V(G) \setminus V(C_j)$ respectively, and there exists a pair $v, w \in S$ as a common witness. A property observed in [23, Lemma 7.6] implies this, but a proof using Lemma 2.2 is more direct.

Lemma 5.1. *Let (G, k) be an instance and S be a good DH-modulator. If C_1, C_2 are two connected components $G - S$ and $v, w \in S$ such that for each $i = 1, 2$,*

- *$(V(C_i), V(G) \setminus V(C_i))$ is a non-split, and*
- *v, w forms a witnessing pair for C_i,*

then $G[\{v, w\} \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)]$ contains a DH obstruction.

Proof. Since $N(v, C_1) \neq \emptyset$, $N(w, C_1) \neq \emptyset$, and $N(v, C_1) \neq N(w, C_1)$, there exists a vertex $z \in V(C_1)$ where z is adjacent to only one of v and w. Without loss of generality, we may assume that z is adjacent to v. We choose a neighbor z' of v in C_2. Clearly, there is a path from z to z' in $G[\{v, w\} \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)] - v$ because w has a neighbor on each of C_1 and C_2. Let P be a shortest path from z to z' in $G[\{v, w\} \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)] - v$. Note that P has length at least 3, as w and z are not adjacent. Thus, by Lemma 2.2, $G[\{v, w\} \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)]$ contains a DH obstruction. □

Lemma 5.2. *Reduction Rule 2 is safe. Moreover, S remains a good DH-modulator after applying the reduction rule.*

Proof. To see that Step (1) is safe, it suffices to show $|V(H) \cap V(C)| \leq 1$ for any DH obstruction H of G. Since $(V(C), V(G) \setminus V(C))$ is a split, any DH obstruction H satisfies that either $|V(H) \cap V(C)| \leq 1$ or $|V(H) \setminus V(C)| \leq 1$. Furthermore, the fact that S is a good DH-modulator implies $|V(H) \setminus V(C)| \geq 2$. Therefore, $|V(H) \cap V(C)| \leq 1$.

To see that Step (2) is safe, let G' be the graph obtained by removing all edges in a non-trivial component C in Step (2). Suppose T is a solution to (G', k). We claim that $(V(C) \setminus T, V(G) \setminus V(C) \setminus T)$ is a split of $G - T$. Since C is considered in Step (2), there is a pair $v, w \in S$ witnessing that $(V(C), V(G) \setminus V(C))$ is a non-split. Fix an arbitrary witnessing pair $v, w \in S$. The fact that C is transformed into an independent set means that there are $k+2$ connected components $C_1, \ldots, C_{k+2}$ of $G - S$ each of which is a non-split witnessed by v and w. From $|T| \leq k$, there are at least two components among these connected components, say C_1 and C_2, such that $V(C_i) \cap T = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2$. By Lemma 5.1, the graph $G[\{v, w\} \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)]$ contains a DH obstruction. Since $G' - T$ does not contain a DH obstruction and $V(C_i) \cap T = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2$, at least one of v and w must be in the solution T. Since T contains at least one vertex of any witnessing pair for C, $(V(C) \setminus T, V(G) \setminus V(C) \setminus T)$ is a split of $G - T$ as claimed.

Suppose that $G - T$ contains a DH obstruction H. By the claim above, we have either $|V(H) \cap V(C)| \leq 1$ or $|V(H) \setminus V(C)| \leq 1$. As S is a good DH-modulator, the only possibility is $|V(H) \cap V(C)| \leq 1$. This means that H is also an induced subgraph of G', a contradiction. Therefore, T is also a solution to (G, k).

For the opposite direction, suppose that T is a solution to (G, k). We note that by a similar argument as above, $(V(C) \setminus T, V(G') \setminus V(C) \setminus T)$ is a split in $G' - T$. Hence, any DH obstruction H in $G' - T$ contains at most one vertex of C, and thus H is also an induced subgraph of $G - T$. This implies (G', k) is a YES-instance if (G, k) is a YES-instance.

To see the second part of the statement holds, suppose that S is not a good DH-modulator after the application of Reduction Rule 2. It is easy to see that S is a DH-modulator: for any vertex set $V(C)$ such that C is a connected component of $G - S$ whose edge set is removed in the reduction rule, $V(C)$ is an independent set in $G' - S$, thus no DH obstruction F in $G' - S$ contains a vertex in $V(C)$. It follows that S is a DH-modulator of G'. Hence, we may assume that S is a DH-modulator of G' and there is a DH osbtruction F in G' such that $|V(F) \cap S| = 1$. Such F must contain at least two vertices u, v such that $uv \notin E(G')$ and $uv \in E(G)$. Notice that the reduction rule ensures that such u, v are adjacent only with the vertices of S. Due to the assumption $|V(F) \cap S| = 1$, u and v are pendant vertices in F, which is not possible for a DH obstruction F. Therefore, S is a good DH-modulator of G'. This complete the proof. □

From Reduction Rule 2, it is immediately derived that the number of non-trivial connected components of $G - S$ is bounded by $|S|^2 \cdot (k+2)$. By Proposition 4.1, the number of trivial connected components of $G - S$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(k|S|^4)$.

6. Bounding the size of non-trivial connected components of $G - S$

Let S be a good DH-modulator of G. In this section, we introduce several reduction rules that bound the number of bags of split decompositions of non-trivial connected components of $G - S$.



FIGURE 3. The way of extending the given distance-hereditary graph G and its split decomposition in Figure 2 by adding a new vertex v. This position can be enumerated in polynomial time using the result of Gioan and Paul [16].

We fix a canonical split decomposition D of a connected component H of $G - S$. Since S is a good DH-modulator, for each vertex v of S, $G[V(H) \cup \{v\}]$ is distance-hereditary. By Theorem 4.1 of [16], in polynomial time, D can be extended to the canonical split decomposition of $G[V(H) \cup \{v\}]$ by modifying some bag or a marked edge of D and putting v. Our strategy is that we color all such bags and marked edges, and reduce the uncolored parts. We define an injective function f from $S \cap N(V(H))$ to the union of the set of all marked edges and the set of all bags where the canonical split decomposition of $G[V(H) \cup \{v\}]$ can be obtained from D by modifying $f(v)$. See Figure 3 for an illustration. For our purpose, it is sufficient to know that such a function f is uniquely defined and can be computed in polynomial time; we refer the readers to [16] for details. We say a bag or a marked edge is *S-affected* if it is $f(v)$ for some $v \in S$, and *S-unaffected* otherwise. We say that a bag B is a *branch bag* if $D - V(B)$ has at least three connected components.

6.1. **Reduction Rules to bound the number of leaf bags.** We assume that D consists of more than one bag. For two adjacent bags B_1 and B_2, we denote by $e(B_1, B_2)$ the marked edge linking B_1 and B_2.

Reduction Rule 3. (1) If v is a vertex of degree at most 1 in G, remove v from G.

(2) Let D be the canonical split decomposition of a non-trivial connected component of $G - S$. Let B be a leaf bag of D and let B' be its neighbor bag such that
- B, B', and $e(B, B')$ are S-unaffected,
- $D - V(B')$ has exactly two connected components, and
- B' is a star bag whose center is adjacent to B.

Then remove the unmarked vertices in B'.

Lemma 6.1. *Reduction Rule 3 is safe.*

Proof. The statement (1) of Reduction Rule 3 is obviously safe. For (2), we claim that there is no DH obstruction containing an unmarked vertex in B'. First observe that B is not a star bag whose leaf is adjacent to B' because D is a canonical split decomposition. Also, every vertex in S is either complete or anti-complete to the set of unmarked vertices in B, as B and $e(B, B')$ are S-unaffected. Thus, the set of unmarked vertices in B is a twin set in G. If G has a DH obstruction H containing an unmarked vertex of B', then H contains at least 2 vertices in B, which is not possible. Thus, we can safely remove the vertices in B'. □

Reduction Rule 4. Let $A \subseteq V(H)$ be a set of vertices that are pairwise twins in G, where H is a connected component of $G - S$. Flip the adjacency relation among the vertices of A if the resulting graph has strictly smaller number of bags in D.

The safety of Reduction Rule 4 is already observed in [9], which is an immediate consequence of the fact that every DH obstruction contains at most one vertex among pairwise twins.

Lemma 6.2. *One can apply Reduction Rules 3 and 4 exhaustively in polynomial time. Furthermore, S is a good DH-modulator in the resulting graph G'.*

Proof. The statement trivially holds for Reduction Rule 3. Let $A \subseteq V(H)$ be a set of vertices that are pairwise twins in G. Then A must be contained in a bag of D. Notice that a twin set in $G - S$ is a twin set in G if and only if it is either complete or anti-complete to each vertex of S, which can be tested in polynomial time. Therefore, by skimming through each bag and a twin set contained in it (and modifying the canonical split decomposition accordingly), we can detect a set A to apply Reduction Rule 4 or correctly decide that no such A exists. Each application of Reduction Rules 3 and 4 reduces either the number of vertices in G or the number of bags, and the statement follows.

To see the second statement holds, we only need to check that S is a good DH-modulator in G' obtained by applying Reduction Rule 4 once. This is an immediate consequence of the fact A is a twin set in G' and no DH obstruction can contain two twin vertices. □

Lemma 6.3. *Let (G, k) be an instance reduced under Reduction Rules 3 and 4 and let D be the canonical split decomposition of a non-trivial connected component of $G - S$. If a leaf bag B of D is S-unaffected, then*

(i) either B is a complete bag or it is a star bag whose center is marked, and
(ii) the unique bag B' adjacent with B is a star bag whose center is adjacent with B.

Proof. Suppose B is a star bag whose center is unmarked. Since B is S-unaffected, there are no edges between S and the set of leaves of B. Thus, each leaf of B is a leaf of G, contradicting that (G, k) is reduced under (1) of Reduction Rule 3. The first statement follows.

To prove (ii), suppose B' is a complete bag. Then B cannot be a complete bag since there cannot be two complete bags adjacent in a canonical split decomposition. Hence by (i), B is a star bag whose center is adjacent with B'. Since B is S-unaffected, each vertex of S is either complete to the set of unmarked vertices of B, or anti-complete to it. So, the set of unmarked vertices of B is a twin set of G and applying Reduction Rule 4 will recompose the marked edge $e(B, B')$, strictly reducing the number of bags. This contradicts that (G, k) is reduced under Reduction Rule 4.

Therefore, B' is a star bag. First assume that a leaf of B' is adjacent to B. In that case, B cannot be a star bag whose center is adjacent to B', because D is a canonical split decomposition. Thus, B is a complete bag. Since B is S-unaffected, the set of unmarked vertices of B is a twin set of G, and applying Reduction Rule 4 will lead to recomposing the marked edge $e(B, B')$, strictly reducing the number of bags. Thus we conclude that the center of B' is adjacent to B. □



FIGURE 4. The special types of bags described in Lemma 6.4. Colored bags or marked edges denote S-affected bags or marked edges, and bags B_1, B_2, B_3 correspond to bags of type (i), (ii), (iv), respectively.

Lemma 6.4. *Let D be the canonical split decomposition of a connected component of $G - S$ reduced under Reduction Rules 3 and 4. If a bag B of D is adjacent with a leaf bag B' and both $e(B, B')$ and B' are S-unaffected, then exactly one of the following holds:*

(i) B is adjacent with a leaf bag $B'' \neq B'$ and B'' is S-affected,
(ii) B is adjacent with no other leaf bag and B is S-affected,
(iii) B is adjacent with no other leaf bag, B is S-unaffected and $D - V(B)$ has at least four connected components,
(iv) B is adjacent with no other leaf bag, B is S-unaffected and $D - V(B)$ has exactly three connected components,

Proof. If B is adjacent with a leaf bag $B'' \neq B'$, then B'' must be S-affected: indeed, B is a star bag whose center is adjacent with B' by Lemma 6.3. Then B'' can only be adjacent with a leaf of B, which by Lemma 6.3 implies that B'' is S-affected.

To complete the proof, it suffices to show that if B is adjacent with no other leaf bag and $D - V(B)$ has exactly two connected components, then B is S-affected. Suppose that B is S-unaffected. Notice that Lemma 6.3 implies that B is a star whose center is adjacent to B'. Thus, we can reduce by (2) of Reduction Rule 3, contradiction. □

We classify the set of bags of D. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the set of all leaf bags of D and let $\mathcal{L}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ be the set of all leaf bags that are either S-affected or incident with an S-affected marked edge. For each leaf bag $B' \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{L}_0$, let B be its unique neighbor bag. We categorize B' into $\mathcal{L}_1$-$\mathcal{L}_4$ whenever B satisfies (i)-(iv) of Lemma 6.4. It is not difficult to see that

$$|\mathcal{L}_0 \cup \mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2| \leq 2|S|.$$

That is, we label each bag $B' \in \mathcal{L}_0$ by $f^{-1}(B')$ if B' is S-affected, or by $f^{-1}(e)$ if the marked edge e incident with B' is S-affected. Each bag $B' \in \mathcal{L}_1$ is labeled by $f^{-1}(B'')$, where B'' is a leaf bag satisfying (i) of Lemma 6.4. We label each bag $B' \in \mathcal{L}_2$ by $f^{-1}(B)$, where B is the unique neighbor that is S-affected (see (iii) of Lemma 6.4). Since every vertex of S contributes to the labeling at most twice, the inequality follows.

Let $\tilde{D}$ be the graph $D - \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{L}_3 \cup \mathcal{L}_4} V(B)$. Notice that the set of all leaf bags in $\tilde{D}$ is exactly $\mathcal{L}_0 \cup \mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2$. We define

- $\mathcal{S}$ as the set of all bags B of $\tilde{D}$ such that B is an S-affected bag, incident with an S-affected marked edge in D.
- $\mathcal{B}$ as the set of all branch bags of $\tilde{D}$.



FIGURE 5. An illustration of Reduction Rule 5.

Notice that $|\mathcal{S}| \leq 2|S|$. Since a branch bag satisfying (iii) of Lemma 6.4 remains a branch bag in $\tilde{D}$, we have $|\mathcal{L}_3| \leq |\mathcal{B}| \leq 2|S| - 1$. Note that $\tilde{D} - \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{L}_0 \cup \mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2} V(B)$ contains at most $|\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{L}_0 \cup \mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2| - 1 \leq 4|S| - 2$ connected components, each of which is a sequence of bags. Therefore, $D - \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{L}} V(B) = \tilde{D} - \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{L}_0 \cup \mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2} V(B)$ contains at most $4|S| - 2 + |\mathcal{S}| \leq 6|S|$ connected components and each of them consists of a sequence of S-unaffected bags. In the next subsection, we introduce two reduction rules to bound the number of bags of each connected component of $D - \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{L}} V(B)$. Notice that this will bound the size of $\mathcal{L}_4$ as well.

6.2. **Reducing the length of a sequence of S-unaffected bags.** We assume that the instance (G, k) is reduced under Reduction Rules 3 and 4. Let D' be a connected component of $D - \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{L}} V(B)$. We introduce two reduction rules that contribute to bound the number of bags in D'. Let us fix the sequence $B_1, \cdots, B_m$ of bags of D'. For $1 \leq i < j < k \leq m$, a bag B_j is called a (B_i, B_k)-*separator bag* if the center of B_j is adjacent to neither B_{j-1} nor B_{j+1}. Below, we present a rule that gives a bound on the number of (B_1, B_m)-separator bags. Note that for each (B_1, B_m)-separator bag B in D', either

- the center of B is unmarked in D, or
- there is a leaf bag B' of D where the center of B is adjacent to B', and B', $e(B, B')$ are S-unaffected.

In the latter case, the bag B is a bag of type (iv) in Lemma 6.4. On the other hand, for every bag B_j in D' with $1 < j < m$ other than (B_1, B_m)-separator bags, there are no leaf bags having B_j as neighbor bags: if B_j has a leaf bag as a neighbor, such a leaf bag must be S-affected because of Lemma 6.3. That is, B_j is a branch bag in $\tilde{D}$, and thus contained in $\mathcal{B}$, contradicting that B_j is a bag in D'.

We describe Reduction Rule 5 in Figure 5.

Reduction Rule 5. Let $B_{a_1}, \ldots, B_{a_6}$ be (B_1, B_m)-separator bags of D' such that $1 < a_1 < \cdots < a_6 < m$, and for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$, there are no $(B_{a_i}, B_{a_{i+1}})$-separator bags. For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$, let U_i be the set consisting of the center of B_{a_i} if it is unmarked in D, and otherwise, let U_i be the set of all unmarked vertices in the leaf bag in D adjacent to B_{a_i}. We do the following:

(1) We remove all bags of D' in between B_{a_2} and B_{a_4} and also remove the leaf bag adjacent to B_{a_3} if exists, and link marked vertices of B_{a_2} and B_{a_4} in D', which were incident with removed marked edges, by a marked edge.
(2) If $|U_2| > |U_3| = 1$, then we remove the leaf bag adjacent to B_{a_2}, and if $|U_2| > |U_3| \geq 2$, then we remove unmarked vertices in the leaf bag adjacent to B_{a_2} except $|U_3|$ many vertices.

Lemma 6.5. *Reduction Rule 5 is safe. Furthermore, in the resulting graph, S is again a good DH-modulator.*

Proof. Suppose there exists an integer j with $a_2 < j < a_3$. We first claim that every unmarked vertex in B_j is not contained in any DH obstruction, and thus it can be safely removed. Let v be an unmarked vertex in B_j, and suppose that there is a DH obstruction F containing v. Since D' consists of only S-unaffected bags and marked edges, there are no edges between S and unmarked vertices in between B_{a_1} and B_{a_5}. We can also observe that each U_i is a set of pairwise twins in G. Thus, for every DH obstruction F, $|V(F) \cap U_i| \leq 1$. Since every DH obstruction is 2-connected, $|V(F) \cap U_i| = 1$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$. Since $|V(F) \cap S| \geq 2$, F cannot be a small DH obstruction. Thus, F is an induced cycle of length at least 7. For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$ let w_i be the vertex in $V(F) \cap U_i$.

If v is contained in a complete bag, then v is adjacent to w_2 and w_3, and thus F contains an induced cycle of length 3, contradiction. We may assume v is contained in a star bag. So, v is adjacent to one of w_2 and w_3. Since F has no leaves, there is a neighbor v' of v in F that is not in $\{w_2, w_3\}$. Since v' is also contained in a star bag, v' is adjacent to one of w_2 and w_3 that is not adjacent to v. However, this implies that F contains an induced cycle of length 4, contradiction. Therefore, v cannot be contained any DH obstruction, and we can safely remove it. By symmetry, if there is a bag B_j with $a_3 < j < a_4$, every vertex in B_j can be safely removed.

Now, we may assume that $B_{a_2}, B_{a_3}, B_{a_4}$ appear consecutively in D'. Let D'' be the canonical split decomposition obtained by the procedures (1) and (2), and let G' be the resulting graph. In the decomposition D'', let $\widetilde{U}$ be the set consisting the center of B_{a_2} if it is unmarked, and otherwise, let $\widetilde{U}$ be the set of all unmarked vertices in the leaf bag adjacent to B_{a_2}. Notice that $G - (U_2 \cup U_3) = G' - \widetilde{U}$.

Claim 3. *(G, k) is a* Yes*-instance if and only if (G', k) is a* Yes*-instance.*

Proof of the Claim: Suppose that G has a vertex set T such that $|T| \leq k$ and $G - T$ is distance-hereditary. First assume that T contains no vertex in $U_2 \cup U_3$, and suppose that $G' - T$ contains a DH obstruction H. If H does not contain a vertex in $\widetilde{U}$, then H is an induced subgraph of $G - T$, as $G - (U_2 \cup U_3) = G' - \widetilde{U}$. This contradicts to our assumption. Thus, H contains a vertex in $\widetilde{U}$, and as $\widetilde{U}$ is a set of pairwise twins in G', $|V(H) \cap \widetilde{U}| = 1$. Let v be the vertex in $V(H) \cap \widetilde{U}$. We observe that H should contain at least one vertex from U_1, U_4, U_5, U_6, and thus H is not a small DH obstruction. So H is an induced cycle of length at least 7, and the neighbors of v in H are contained in U_1 and U_4. Thus we can obtain an induced cycle of length at least 7 by replacing v with a vertex of U_2 and a vertex of U_3 in G, which implies that $G - T$ contains a DH obstruction. It contradicts to our assumption.

We may assume $T \cap (U_2 \cup U_3) \neq \emptyset$. As U_i is a set of pairwise twins in G, if $T \cap U_i \neq \emptyset$, then $U_i \subseteq T$. We can observe that $T \setminus (U_2 \cup U_3) \cup \widetilde{U}$ is a solution to (G', k) and we have $|T \setminus (U_2 \cup U_3) \cup \widetilde{U}| \leq |T| \leq k$. It implies that (G', k) is a YES-instance.

For the converse direction, suppose that G' has a vertex set T' such that $|T'| \leq k$ and $G' - T'$ is distance-hereditary. We first assume that $T' \cap \widetilde{U} = \emptyset$. Suppose $G - T'$ has a DH obstruction H. We have $V(H) \cap (U_2 \cup U_3) \neq \emptyset$, otherwise H is an induced subgraph of $G' - T'$. As U_2 and U_3 are sets of pairwise twins in G, H contains at most one vertex from each of U_2 and U_3. We observed that if a DH obstruction contains a vertex of U_2 or U_3, then it contains one vertex from each of $U_1, \ldots, U_5$, and thus it is an induced cycle of length at least 7. We can obtain an induced cycle of length at least 6 in $G' - T'$ from H by contracting the edge between $V(H) \cap U_2$ and $V(H) \cap U_3$, which contradicts to the assumption that $G' - T'$ is distance-hereditary. We conclude that $G - T'$ is distance-hereditary in the case when $T' \cap \widetilde{U} = \emptyset$.

Lastly, suppose $T' \cap \widetilde{U} \neq \emptyset$. As $\widetilde{U}$ is a set of pairwise twins in G', we have $\widetilde{U} \subseteq T'$. We obtain a set T from T' by removing $\widetilde{U}$, and adding U_i with $i \in \{2, 3\}$ where $|U_i| = \min\{|U_2|, |U_3|\}$. If $|U_2| = |U_3|$, then we add one of them chosen arbitrarily. Clearly, $|T| \leq |T'| \leq k$. We can observe that $G - T$ has no DH obstruction containing a vertex in $U_2 \cup U_3$. Since $G - (U_2 \cup U_3) = G' - \widetilde{U}$ has no DH obstructions, we conclude that $G - T$ is distance-hereditary, as required. ♢

This proves that Reduction Rule 5 is safe. We argue that S is again a good DH-modulator in G'. The proof line is similar to the forward direction of **Claim 3**. We need to verify that for every $v \in S$, $G'[(V(G) \setminus S) \cup \{v\}]$ has no DH obstructions. Suppose for contradiction that $G'[(V(G) \setminus S) \cup \{v\}]$ contains a DH obstruction H for some $v \in S$. The obstruction H should contain a vertex in $\widetilde{U}$, otherwise, H is also a DH obstruction in $G[(V(G) \setminus S) \cup \{v\}]$. Observe that H should contain at least one vertex from U_1, U_4, U_5, U_6, and thus H is an induced cycle of length at least 6, and the neighbors of v in H are contained in U_1 and U_4. Thus we can obtain an induced cycle of length at least 7 by replacing the vertex in $V(H) \cap \widetilde{U}$ with a vertex of U_2 and a vertex of U_3 in G, which implies that $G[(V(G) \setminus S) \cup \{v\}]$ contains a DH obstruction. It contradicts to our assumption that S is a good DH-modulator. We conclude that S is a good DH-modulator in the resulting graph. □

Reduction Rule 6. Let $B_a - B_{a+1} - \cdots - B_b$ be a subsequence of in D' such that $b - a \geq 6k + 25$ and for each $i \in \{a + 1, \ldots, b - 1\}$, B_i is not a (B_a, B_b)-separator bag. Among $B_{a+1} - B_{a+2} - \cdots - B_{b-1}$, we mark up to $k + 1$ bags for each types : complete bags, star bags B_i whose centers are adjacent to B_{i+1}, and star bags whose centers are adjacent to B_{i-1}. Choose a bag B_j with $a + 1 \leq j \leq b - 1$ that is not marked after finishing the marking procedure, and remove vertices in B_j from G.

As the application of Reduction Rule 6 is to remove some vertex in $G - S$, S is again a good DH-modulator in the resulting graph. We observe the every DH obstruction can be turned into an induced path by removing a vertex v. Note that this vertex is not unique; for instance, we can choose any vertex in an induced cycle of length 5, and there are two such vertices in the house. We will use this observation.

Lemma 6.6. *Reduction Rule 6 is safe.*

Proof. Suppose B_j is a bag that is not marked after finishing the marking procedure in Reduction Rule 6, and let $v \in V(B_j)$. We prove that (G, k) is a YES-instance if and only if $(G - v, k)$ is a YES-instance. The forward direction is clear. Suppose that $G - v$ has a solution T with $|T| \leq k$, and $G - T$ contains a DH obstruction F. Note that $v \in V(F)$.

We partition the vertex set $V(G)$ into four parts. Let U be the set of all unmarked vertices in $B_{a+1}, B_{a+2}, \ldots, B_{b-1}$. Since D' consists of only S-unaffected bags, there are two types of neighborhoods in $\{N_G(v) \cap U : v \in V(G) \setminus U\}$ which correspond to marked edges $e(B_a, B_{a+1})$ and $e(B_{b-1}, B_b)$. Let A_1 and A_2 be the vertex subsets of $V(G) \setminus U$ having neighbors in U with those types, where A_1 corresponds to $e(B_a, B_{a+1})$ and A_2 corresponds to $e(B_{b-1}, B_b)$. It is clear that A_1 and A_2 are disjoint because for each $v \in S$, $f(v)$ is a unique place in the decomposition D. Let $W := V(G) \setminus (U \cup A_1 \cup A_2)$.

Suppose $|V(F) \cap U| = 1$. By the marking procedure, there are at least $k + 1$ bags that are distinct from B_j and have the same type with B_j. Therefore, there is a vertex v' not contained in T, where $G[V(F) \setminus \{v\} \cup \{v'\}]$ is a DH obstruction of $(G - v) - T$. We may assume that $|V(F) \cap U| \geq 2$. In this case, it is difficult to say that we can replace v with a marked vertex to obtain a DH obstruction as we do not know the positions of the other vertices of $V(F) \cap U$. In what follows, we show that $(G - v) - T$ contains a DH obstruction in a different way, which leads a contradiction.

We choose $f \in V(F)$ such that $F - f$ is an induced path. Call this path P, and let w and z be the end vertices of P. Let w' and z' be the neighbors of w and z in P, respectively.

Claim 4. *w and z cannot be contained in U together.*

PROOF OF THE CLAIM: Suppose w and z are contained in U. Without loss of generality, $w \in B_x$ and $z \in B_y$ for some $x \leq y$. Since they are not adjacent, either B_x is a star whose center is adjacent to B_{x-1} or B_y is a star whose center is adjacent to B_{y+1}. By symmetry, assume that B_y is a star bag whose center is adjacent to B_{y+1}. Since v is adjacent to both w and z, B_x should be either a complete bag, or a star bag whose center is adjacent to B_{x+1}. Then z' should be also adjacent to w, which is contradiction. ◊

Claim 5. *If one of w and z is in $A_1 \cup A_2$ and the other is contained in U, then $(G - v) - T$ contains a DH obstruction.*

PROOF OF THE CLAIM: Without loss of generality, we assume that $w \in A_1$ and $z \in U$. Since w is not adjacent to z, z is contained in a star bag B_x whose center is adjacent to B_{x+1} for some x. If $z' \in U$, then z' should be adjacent to w. Thus, we have $z' \in A_2$.

If there are $k + 4$ bags B_p with $p > x$ where B_p is either a complete bag or a star bag whose center is adjacent to B_{p-1}, then there is a bag among them having no vertex in $T \cup V(F)$. Clearly, when F is an induced cycle, F cannot contain 2 vertices among them, otherwise F contains C_4. So the unmarked vertex in the bag having no vertex of $T \cup V(F)$ will form a DH obstruction in $(G - v) - T$ with P by Lemma 2.2. We may assume that there are at most $k + 3$ such bags, and it implies that there are at most $2k + 7$ bags B_p with $x < p < b$ in total.

Now, we consider bags B_p with $a < p < x$. Since f is adjacent to both w and z, either $v \in A_2$ or f is contained in a bag $B_{x'}$ for some $x' > x$ where $B_{x'}$ is either a complete bag or a star bag whose center is adjacent to $B_{x'-1}$. If there are $k + 4$ complete bags B_p with $a < p < x$, then there is a bag among them having no vertex in $T \cup V(F)$. We can observe that the unmarked vertex u in the bag together with $\{w, z, z', v\}$ forms a DH obstruction



FIGURE 6. Claim 6 in Lemma 6.6. The first case is the case when P has length more than 3, and the red path denotes the path from c_2 to z in $G[V(P) \cup \{c_2\}]$ implies that $G[V(P) \cup \{c_1, c_2\}]$ contains a DH obstruction. When P has length 3 and c_1 is adjacent to z' and c_2 is adjacent to w', we can take c_3 instead of c_1 to find a DH obstruction.

because $wuz'z$ is an induced path and f is adjacent to its end vertices. Thus, we may assume there are at most $k+3$ complete bags B_p with $a < p < x$.

Now, if there are $k+4$ pairwise disjoint pairs of star bags B_p and B_q with $a < p < q < x$ where the center of B_p is adjacent to B_{p+1} and the center of B_q is adjacent to B_{q-1}, then there is one such pair having no vertex in $T \cup V(F)$. We can observe that the unmarked vertices $u_1 \in B_p$ and $u_2 \in B_q$ for such bags together with $\{w, z, z', v\}$ contains a DH obstruction, as $wu_2u_1z'z$ is an induced path and f is adjacent to its end vertices. So, we may assume that there are at most $k+3$ such pairs. From B_{a+1} to B_{x-1}, the direction of two consecutive stars are the same only when there is a complete bag between them. Since it is possible that the center of B_{a+1} is not adjacent to B_{a+2} or the center of B_{b-1} is not adjacent to B_{b-2}, together with complete bags, there are at most $(k+3) + (2 + (k+3) + (2k+7)) = 4k+15$ bags B_p with $a < p < x$.

It implies that $b - a \leq ((6k+22)+3) - 1 = 6k+24$, but this contradicts to our assumption. ◊

Claim 6. *If w and z are contained in $A_1 \cup A_2$, then $(G-v)-T$ contains a DH obstruction.*

PROOF OF THE CLAIM: First assume that both w and z are contained in A_i for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $w, z \in A_1$. If there are at least $k+5$ bags B_x of D' that are either complete bags or star bags whose centers are adjacent to B_{x-1}, then there is a bag among them having no vertex in $T \cup V(F)$, and an unmarked vertex in the bag will form a DH obstruction with P. We may assume the number of such bags is at most $k+4$. This implies that $b - a \leq (2k+9) - 1 = 2k+8$, which contradicts to our assumption. We may assume that w and z are contained in distinct sets of A_1 and A_2. Without loss of generality, we assume $w \in A_1$ and $z \in A_2$.

By the same argument, if there are $k+5$ complete bags B_p with $a \leq p \leq b$, then $(G - v) - T$ contains a DH obstruction. We may assume that there are at most $k+4$ complete bags. Now, if there are $k+5$ pairwise disjoint tuples of star bags B_p, B_q, B_r with $p < q < r$ where they have alternatively different directions of centers. Then we can choose such a tuple B_p, B_q, B_r having no vertex in $T \cup V(F)$. Let $c_1 \in B_p, c_2 \in B_q, c_3 \in B_r$ be unmarked vertices. We show that $G[V(P) \cup \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}]$ contains a DH obstruction.

Note that either $c_1c_2 \in E(G), c_2c_3 \notin E(G)$ or $c_1c_2 \notin E(G), c_2c_3 \in E(G)$. We check for only one case, since the other case is similar. Suppose $c_1c_2 \in E(G)$ and $c_2c_3 \notin E(G)$. We observe that c_1 is adjacent to z but not w, and c_2 is adjacent to w but not z. If c_2 is adjacent to a vertex on P which has distance at least 3 to w, then there is a DH obstruction by Lemma 2.2. Similarly, if c_1 is adjacent to a vertex on P which has distance at least 3 to z, then there is a DH obstruction by Lemma 2.2. Thus we may assume that those cases do not appear. See Figure 6 for an illustration of the following cases. Now if P has length more than 3, then there is a DH obstruction, because the distance from c_2 to z in $G[V(P) \cup \{c_2\}]$ is at least 3 and c_1 is adjacent to c_2 and z. So, we can assume that P has length 3, and c_1 is adjacent to w' and c_2 is adjacent to z'. In this case, $G[V(P) \cup \{c_2, c_3\}]$ contains a DH obstruction, as required.

Therefore, we can assume that there are no such $(k+5)$ pairwise disjoint tuples. It implies that there are at most $2(k+4) + 3(k+4) = 5k+20$ bags. It contradicts to our assumption that $b - a \geq 6k + 25$. ◊

It remains to check when one of w and z is contained in W.

Claim 7. *If one of w and z is contained in W, then $(G-v)-T$ contains a DH obstruction.*

Proof of the Claim: When F is an induced cycles of length at least 5, we can choose another pair f' and P' instead of f and P so that $V(P') \cup \{v'\} = V(F)$, P' is an induced path, and $f' \in U$. So, then the end vertices of P' are contained in $U \cup A_1 \cup A_2$, and the previous claims imply that $(G - v) - T$ contains a DH obstruction. Therefore, we may assume that F is a small DH obstruction that is not an induced cycle. Let w'' be the vertex in $V(P) \setminus \{w, w', z, z'\}$ if F is isomorphic to the domino.

Without loss of generality, $w \in W$. If $f \in W$, then $\{f, w, w', z\} \subseteq V(F) \cap (A_1 \cup A_2 \cup W)$. Since $|V(F) \cap U| \geq 2$, F should be isomorphic to the domino and $V(F) \cap U = \{w'', z'\}$. But f is adjacent to w'', which is contradiction. Therefore, we have $f \in A_1 \cup A_2$, and we can observe that $V(F) \cap U \subseteq V(P) \setminus \{w, w'\}$. We remark that $V(F) \cap A_i \neq \emptyset$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, otherwise $(V(F) \cap U, V(F) \cap W \cap A_{3-i})$ is a split of F, contradicting the fact that F has no splits. We divide cases depending on whether F is isomorphic to the domino or not, and possible subsets $V(F) \cap U$.

Case 1. F is not isomorphic to the domino.

Since F is not isomorphic to the domino, P has length 3 and thus $V(F) \cap U = \{z, z'\}$, and w' is contained in one of A_1 and A_2 that does not contain f. We observe that every 4 consecutive bags in $B_a, \ldots, B_b$ contain two bags B_x, B_{x+1} such that either

- B_x is a complete bag and B_{x+1} is a star bag whose center is adjacent to B_x,
- B_x is a star bag whose center is adjacent to B_{x+1} and B_{x+1} is a complete bag, or
- B_x and B_{x+1} are star bags and their centers are adjacent.

Let $p \in B_x$, $q \in B_{x+1}$ be unmarked vertices for such bags B_x and B_{x+1}. One can observe that in any cases, $G[\{p, q, v, w, w'\}]$ is isomorphic to a DH obstruction. As $(a-1) - (b+1)+1 \geq 4(k+4)$, there is a pair of such bag B_x and B_{x+1} containing no vertex in $T \cup V(F)$. So, $(G - v) - T$ contains a DH obstruction.

Case 2. F is isomorphic to the domino.

First assume $w'' \in V(F) \cap U$. In this case, we consider another pair w'' and $F - w''$. Then two end vertices of w'' are contained in $U \cup A_1 \cup A_2$, and thus by Claim 4,5,6, $(G - v) - T$ contains a DH obstruction. Thus, we may assume $V(F) \cap U = \{z, z'\}$.

Since z is adjacent to f but not to w'' and z' is adjacent to w'' but not to f, f and w'' are contained in distinct sets of A_1 and A_2. But then w' is adjacent to one of z and z', contradiction. ◊

We conclude that (G, k) is a YES-instance if and only if $(G-v, k)$ is a YES-instance. □

6.3. **The size of a nontrivial component.**

Lemma 6.7. *Let (G, k) be an instance reduced under Reduction Rules 3, 4, 5, and 6 and let D be the canonical split decomposition of a non-trivial connected component of $G-S$. If D' be a connected component of $D - \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{S}\cup\mathcal{B}\cup\mathcal{L}} V(B)$, then D' contains at most $36k+157$ bags.*

Proof. Let $B_1, \cdots, B_m$ be a sequence of bags in D'. By Reduction Rule 5, D' contains at most five (B_1, B_m)-separator bags B_j. By Reduction Rule 6, there are at most $6k + 25$ consecutive bags B_j that are not (B_1, B_m)-separator bags. In total, D' contains at most $2 + 6(6k + 25) + 5 = 36k + 157$ bags. □

We summarized the main result of this section.

Lemma 6.8. *Let (G, k) be an instance reduced under Reduction Rules 3, 4, 5, and 6 and let D be the canonical split decomposition of a non-trivial connected component of $G - S$. Then D has at most $38|S| - 2 + 6|S| \cdot (36k + 157)$ bags.*

Proof. At Subsection 6.1, we analyzed that $|\mathcal{S}| \leq 2|S|$, $|\mathcal{L}_0 \cup \mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2| \leq 4|S| - 1$, and $|\mathcal{L}_3| \leq |\mathcal{B}| \leq 2|S| - 1$. For any S-unaffected leaf bag B in $\mathcal{L}_4$, the unique bag adjacent with B is a star bag whose center is adjacent with B by Lemma 6.3. Since (G, k) is reduced under Reduction Rule 5, each connected component D' of $D - \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{S}\cup\mathcal{B}\cup\mathcal{L}} V(B)$ contains at most 5 star bags that can possibly have $B \in \mathcal{L}_4$ as a neighbor. Since there are at most $6|S|$ such components D', we have $|\mathcal{L}_4| \leq 30|S|$. Each connected component D' of $D - \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{S}\cup\mathcal{B}\cup\mathcal{L}} V(B)$ contains at most $36k + 157$ bags by Lemma 6.7, and there are at most $6|S|$ such components D'. To summarize, we have at most $38|S| - 2 + 6|S|(36k + 157)$ bags in D. □

7. Polynomial kernel for Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion

We present a proof of Theorem 1.1 in this section. We already know the bounds on the number of connected components from Section 5 and on the size of a nontrivial component from Sections 4 and 6. What remains is to obtain a good DH-modulator whose existence has been merely assumed so far. Subsection 7.1 presents sunflower-type reduction rules and argues their applicability in polynomial time using Mader's $\mathcal{S}$-path theorem. In Subsection 7.2, we explain how to obtain a DH-modulator using the approximation algorithm of Section 3 and how to extend it into a good one using the result of Subsection 7.1. Finally in Subsection 7.3, we summarize the proof.

7.1. **Sunflower and blocking set.**

Given a graph G and a vertex v in G, a *p-sunflower* at v is a collection of p induced cycles of length at least five whose pairwise intersection is precisely $\{v\}$. We propose two reduction rules.

Reduction Rule 7. Let (G, k) be an instance of Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion. If G contains $k + 1$ small DH obstructions whose pairwise intersection is precisely $\{v\}$, then remove v and decrease k by one.

Reduction Rule 8. Let (G, k) be an instance of Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion. If G contains a $(k+1)$-sunflower at v, then remove v and decrease k by one.

The soundness of the above reduction rules are obvious. We shall apply Reduction Rule 7 in a greedy manner, see Subsection 7.2 for details. Whether Reduction Rule 8 runs in polynomial time in general in not obvious. In fact, we shall apply Reduction Rule 8 when $G - v$ is distance-hereditary, which is sufficient for our purpose.

Proposition 7.1. *Let G be a graph without any small DH obstruction, v be a vertex of G such that $G - v$ is distance-hereditary and k be a positive integer. In polynomial time, one can either*

(1) find a set $X \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{v\}$ of size at most $O(k^2)$ such that $G - X$ contains no induced cycle of length at least 5 traversing v, or
(2) correctly answer that there is a $(k+1)$-sunflower at v.

To prove Proposition 7.1, we rely on Mader's $\mathcal{S}$-paths theorem [26]. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a collection of disjoint subsets of $V(G)$. An $\mathcal{S}$-path is a path connecting two distinct sets of $\mathcal{S}$. Let $S := \bigcup \mathcal{S}$.

Theorem 7.2 (Mader's $\mathcal{S}$-path Theorem [26])**.** *The maximum number of disjoint $\mathcal{S}$-paths is equal to the minimum value of*

$$|U_0| + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \lfloor \frac{1}{2}|B_i| \rfloor$$

taken over all partitions $U_0, \ldots, U_\ell$ of $V(G)$ such that each $\mathcal{S}$-path disjoint from U_0 traverses some edge spanned by some U_i. Here B_i denotes the set of vertices in U_i that belong to S or have a neighbour in $V(G) \setminus (U_0 \cup U_i)$.

It is not difficult to derive the following observation from Theorem 7.2.

Lemma 7.3. *Given a graph G and a collection $\mathcal{S}$ of disjoint subsets of $V(G)$, either there are $k+1$ disjoint $\mathcal{S}$-paths, or there exists a set $X \subseteq V(G)$ of size at most $2k$ such that $G - X$ contains no $\mathcal{S}$-path.*

Proof. Suppose that the maximum number of disjoint $\mathcal{S}$-paths is at most k. By Theorem 7.2, there exists a partition $U_0, U_1, \ldots, U_\ell$ of $V(G)$ such that

$$|U_0| + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \lfloor \frac{1}{2}|B_i| \rfloor \leq k$$

and each $\mathcal{S}$-path disjoint from U_0 traverses some edge spanned by some U_i, where B_i denotes the set of vertices in U_i that belong to S or have a neighbour in $V(G) \setminus (U_0 \cup U_i)$. Let us take $X \subseteq V(G)$ so as to contain all vertices of U_0 and $2 \times \lfloor \frac{1}{2}|B_i| \rfloor$ vertices of B_i. Obviously, $|X| \leq 2k$.

We claim that $G - X$ contains no $\mathcal{S}$-path. Suppose P is an $\mathcal{S}$-path in $G - X$ and let u and v be the end vertices of P in S. For $u, v \in S \setminus X \subseteq (\bigcup_{i=0}^{\ell} B_i) \setminus X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} (B_i \setminus X)$ and $|B_i \setminus X| \leq 1$ for every i, we know that u and v belongs to distinct parts of $U_1, \ldots, U_\ell$. Without loss of generality, let $u \in U_1$ and $v \in U_2$. That $|B_i \setminus X| \leq 1$ also implies that P traverses at most one vertex of U_i for $i = 3, \ldots, \ell$. Since P is disjoint from $X \supseteq U_0$, P traverses an edge e spanned by U_1 or U_2, say U_1. However, the maximal subpath of P

containing e has both endvertices in B_i, contradicting $|B_1 \setminus X| \leq 1$. Therefore, $G - X$ contains no $\mathcal{S}$-path. □

Lemma 7.4. *Let G be a graph without any small DH obstructions, and v be a vertex of G such that $G - v$ is distance-hereditary. For $x, y, z \in N_G(v)$, if $\mathrm{dist}_{G-v}(x, y) \leq 2$ and $\mathrm{dist}_{G-v}(y, z) \leq 2$, then $\mathrm{dist}_{G-v}(x, z) \leq 2$.*

Proof. We may assume that all three vertices are distinct. Let P_{xy} and P_{yz} be paths of length at most two between x, y and y, z respectively. If $\mathrm{dist}_{G-v}(x, z) \geq 3$, then the concatenation $P_{xy} \circ P_{yz}$, whose length is at most 4, contains an induced path P of length 3 or 4. Observe that by Lemma 2.2, $G[V(P) \cup \{v\}]$ contains a DH obstruction. For $|V(P)| \leq 5$, G contains a small DH obstruction, a contradiction. □

We are ready to prove Proposition 7.1.

Proof of Proposition 7.1. We define a relation $\sim_v$ on $N_G(v)$ such that

- $x \sim_v y$ if and only if $\mathrm{dist}_{G-v}(x, y) \leq 2$.

By Lemma 7.4, $\sim_v$ is an equivalence relation on $N_G(v)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the partition of $N_G(v)$ each part of which is an equivalence class under $\sim_v$.

Consider an instance $(G - v, \mathcal{T})$ of Vertex Multicut where

$$\mathcal{T} := \{(s, t) : s, t \in N_G(v), \mathrm{dist}_{G-v}(s, t) \geq 3\}.$$

First, we claim that $X \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{v\}$ hits all induced cycles of G of length at least 5 if and only if X is a vertex multicut for $(G - v, \mathcal{T})$. Suppose X is a vertex multicut for $(G - v, \mathcal{T})$ and H is an induced cycle of length at least 5 in $G - X$. Clearly v is a vertex of H and $H - v$ is a path of length at least 3 between, say, s and t. This means $\mathrm{dist}_{G-v}(s, t) \geq 3$ because $G-v$ is distance-hereditary and thus $(s, t) \in \mathcal{T}$, contradicting the assumption that X hits all paths between every terminal pair in $\mathcal{T}$. Conversely, suppose $X \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{v\}$ hits all induced cycles of length at least 5 and there is an (s, t)-path P in $(G - v) - X$ for some $(s, t) \in \mathcal{T}$. Note that P is of length at least 3 and thus by Lemma 2.2, $G[\{v\} \cup V(P)]$ contains a DH obstruction H. By the assumption that G does not contain a small DH obstruction, H is an induced cycle of length at least 7 in $G - X$, a contradiction.

Let x^* be an optimal fractional solution to Vertex Multicut, which can be efficiently found using the ellipsoid method and an algorithm for the (weighted) shortest path problem as a separation oracle. If $|x^*| > 2k$, then especially the integral solution to Vertex Multicut is larger than $2k$. By construction of $\mathcal{T}$, the minimum number of vertices of $V(G) \setminus \{v\}$ hitting all $\mathcal{F}$-paths is larger than $2k$. This implies that there are $k+1$ $\mathcal{F}$-paths in $G-v$ by Lemma 7.3 and the observation in the previous paragraph. That is, there exists a $(k + 1)$-sunflower at v. If $|x^*| \leq 2k$, using the algorithm of Theorem 3.12 we obtain an integral solution X to Vertex Multicut such that $|X| = O(|x^*|^2) = O(k^2)$. As argued above, X is a desired set hitting all induced cycles of length at least 5 traversing v. This completes the proof. □

7.2. **Preparing a good DH-modulator.** We prove the following theorem.

Theorem 7.5. *There is a polynomial-time algorithm which, given a graph G and a positive integer k, either*

(1) returns an equivalent instance (G', k') with a good DH-modulator $S \subseteq V(G')$ of size $O(k^6)$, or

(2) correctly reports that (G, k) *is a* No*-instance to* Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion.

Our algorithm as stated in Theorem 7.5 proceeds in three stages. At Stage (I), we find a vertex subset S_1 such that $G - S_1$ contains no small DH obstruction. At Stage (II), we construct a DH-modulator S_2 of $G - S_1$ containing at most $O(k^4)$ vertices using Theorem 3.1. The vertex set $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DH-modulator, but it might not be a good one. The Stage (III) is the place where we expand S and turn it into a good DH-modulator. This is done by applying Reduction Rules 7 and 8 to every vertex $v \in S$ and $G[(V(G) \setminus S) \cup \{v\}]$ when applicable, and also add a hitting set $O(k^2)$ of all DH obstructions containing exactly one vertex of S for each vertex of S.

To be precise, given an instance (G, k) of Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion, our algorithm for Theorem 7.5 works as follows.

(I)-0: $S_i \leftarrow \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

(I)-1: While there exists $X \subseteq V(G) \setminus S_1$ such that $G[X]$ is a DH obstruction of size at most 6; $S_1 \leftarrow S_1 \cup X$.

(I)-2: If $|S_1| > 6k$, then report that (G, k) is a No-instance.

(II): Apply the algorithm of Theorem 3.1 to $G - S_1$, and either report that (G, k) is a No-instance or find a DH-modulator S_2 of $G - S_1$ of size $O(k^4)$.

(III)-0: $S \leftarrow S_1 \cup S_2$.

(III)-1: For every $v \in S$, we greedily pack vertex sets $X_1, \ldots, X_p$ of $V(G) \setminus S$ such that $|X_i| \leq 5$ and $G[X_i \cup \{v\}]$ is a DH obstruction for each i.

- If $p \geq k + 1$, apply Reduction Rule 7; remove v from G, $k \leftarrow k - 1$.
- Otherwise, $S_3 \leftarrow S_3 \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{p} X_i$.

(III)-2: For every $v \in S$, we apply Proposition 7.1 to $G - (S \cup S_3) \setminus \{v\}$.

- If the existence of a $(k+1)$-sunflower at v is reported, apply Reduction Rule 8; remove v from G, $k \leftarrow k - 1$.
- Otherwise, $S_3 \leftarrow S_3 \cup X$, where X is a vertex set of $G - (S \cup S_3)$ with $|X| = O(k^2)$ such that $(G - (S \cup S_3) \setminus \{v\}) - X$ contains no induced cycle of length at least 5 containing v.

(III)-3: Return $S \leftarrow S \cup S_3$.

Let us verify the correctness of the algorithm. If $|S_1| > 6k$ in (I)-2, then indeed G contains $k + 1$ disjoint DH obstructions, which certifies that (G, k) is a No-instance. Since $G - S_1$ contains no small DH obstruction at the end of (I), we can apply Theorem 3.1 and (II) can be correctly executed. Notice that $S := S_1 \cup S_2$ at (III)-0 is a DH-modulator of G.

In (III)-2, $G-(S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3)$ is distance-hereditary. Moreover, $G-(S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3) \setminus \{v\}$ does not contain a small DH obstruction due to the construction of S_3 in (III)-1. Therefore, Proposition 7.1 is applicable to $v \in S_1 \cup S_2$ and $G - (S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3) \setminus \{v\}$ in (III)-2.

It is clear that Reduction Rules 7 and 8 are applicable in (III)-1 and (III)-2 for the respective case. The correctness of the obtained instance follows from the soundness of both Reduction Rules. For $|S_1| \leq 6k$, $|S_2| = O(k^4)$ and $|S_3| = |S| \cdot (5k + O(k^2)) = O(k^6)$, and thus we have $|S| = O(k^6)$. It remains to see that S obtained at the end of algorithm is indeed a good DH-modulator. As $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DH-modulator of G, clearly S is a DH-modulator as well. That S is good follows easily from the construction of S_3 in (III)-1 and (III)-2, and the fact that $G - (S_1 \cup S_2)$ is distance-hereditary. Each step of the algorithm runs in polynomial time, hence the overall runtime is polynomial as well. This proves Theorem 7.5.

7.3. **Polynomial kernel for Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion.** Finally, we prove the main result of this paper.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Theorem 7.5, we can obtain a good DH-modulator S of size at most $O(k^6)$ in polynomial time. We first apply Reduction Rule 2 to (G, k) with S. After that, $G - S$ has at most $|S|^2 \cdot (k+2)$ nontrivial connected components. Then apply Reduction Rule 1 exhaustively in polynomial time. This bounds the size of a twin set in $G - S$ by $O(k|S|^4)$ by Lemma 4.1. Especially, the same bounds apply to the number of trivial components in $G - S$ since they form an independent set in $G - S$. It remains to bound the size of a nontrivial connected component of $G - S$.

We apply Reduction Rules 3, 4, 5, and 6 exhaustively. The first two rules can be applied exhaustively in polynomial time by Lemma 6.2. Polynomial-time applicability of Reduction Rules 5, and 6 is straightforward. We remark that, as verified earlier, S is a good DH-modulator after each application of one of these reduction rules. When (G, k) is reduced, by Lemma 6.8, the canonical split decomposition D of each non-trivial connected component of $G - S$ has at most $38|S| - 2 + 6|S| \cdot (36k + 157)$ bags. We note that the unmarked vertices of a bag form at most two twin sets. Therefore, the number of unmarked vertices in a bag is bounded by $O(k|S|^4)$ by Lemma 4.1. Therefore, each non-trivial connected component of $G - S$ contains at most $O(k^2|S|^5)$ vertices.

To summarize, the obtained instance has at most $|S|+O(k|S|^4)+O((k+2)|S|^2 \cdot k^2|S|^5) = O(k^{45})$ vertices. The equivalence of the obtained instance and the initial (G, k) follows from the soundness of all the reduction rules we used. This completes the proof. □

8. Concluding remarks

We used Vertex Multicut to prove Proposition 7.1. Lovasz [25] showed that $\mathcal{S}$-path packing problem and the min-max duality is a special case of linear matroid parity problem and the corresponding duality. Matroid parity problem is NP-hard even with a compact representation [25], but for linear matroid it can be efficiently solved. We can use such an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$, for example [25] or [4] for a more recent treatement. Such algorithms deliver $k+1$ $\mathcal{S}$-paths if they exist, but a decision algorithm suffices for our problem. Moreover, the optimal dual solution satisfying Mader's $\mathcal{S}$-path theorem can be efficiently computed via computing an optimal dual solution for the corresponding linear matroid parity problem, see [27].

Then the following improved version of Propositon 7.1 can be proved.

Proposition 8.1. *Let G be a graph without any small DH obstruction, v be a vertex of G such that $G - v$ is distance-hereditary and k be a positive integer. In polynomial time, one can decide whether there is $k+1$-sunflower at v or find a set $X \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{v\}$ of size at most $2k$ such that $G - X$ contains no induced cycle of length at least 5 traversing v.*

Proof. We apply a polynomial-time algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ to the graph $G - v$ with $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is defined as in Subsection 7.1. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ reports that there are $k+1$ disjoint $\mathcal{F}$-paths. We claim that there is a $k+1$-sunflower at v. Let P be one of the collection of $k+1$ $\mathcal{F}$-paths. We may assume that $x \in F_1$ and $y \in F_2$ are the end vertices of P. By construction of $\mathcal{F}$, we have $\mathrm{dist}_{G-v}(x, y) \geq 3$, and P has length at least 3 as well since $G - v$ is distance-hereditary. By Lemma 2.2, $G[V(P) \cup \{v\}]$ contains a DH obstruction, which can be only an induced cycle of length at least 7 traversing v as we assume that G does not contain a small DH obstruction.

Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ returns a set X such that $G - v - X$ contains no $\mathcal{F}$-path. Then $G - X$ contains no induced cycle of length at least 5 traversing v. Indeed, for any induced cycle C in $G - X$ traversing v, the two neighbors x, y of v in C belong to the same part F of $\mathcal{F}$. By definition of $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathrm{dist}_{G-v}(x, y) \leq 2$ and thus C is an induced cycle of length at most 4. □

In this paper, we give a simpler-to-describe algorithm via an approximation algorithm for Vertex Multicut instead of using a blackbox reduction to and an (apparently hard-to-comprehend) algorithm for linear matroid parity problem. An interesting question is, can we efficiently find the primal and dual optimal solution satisfying Mader's $\mathcal{S}$-path theorem without using a reduction to linear matroid parity problem? We are not aware of any literature claiming such an algorithm.

Apparently, there is much room to improve the kernel size $O(k^{45})$ presented in this work. On the other hand, in terms of the size of a given DH-modulator, the obtained kernel size is below $O(|S|^8)$ and for this, the size $O(k \cdot |S|^4)$ of a twin set in $G - S$ owns a major share. The bound on the size of a twin set seems to be difficult to improve with respect to $|S|$, see the discussion at the end of Section 4. In this context, one might ask for a kernelization lower bound for Distance-hereditary Vertex Deletion parameterized by the size of a DH-modulator.

References

[1] I. Adler, M. M. Kanté, and O. Kwon. Linear rank-width of distance-hereditary graphs I. A polynomial-time algorithm. *Algorithmica*, pages 1–36, 2016.

[2] H.-J. Bandelt and H. M. Mulder. Distance-hereditary graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 41(2):182–208, 1986.

[3] A. Bouchet. Transforming trees by successive local complementations. *J. Graph Theory*, 12(2):195–207, 1988.

[4] H. Y. Cheung, L. C. Lau, and K. M. Leung. Algebraic algorithms for linear matroid parity problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 10(3):10:1–10:26, 2014.

[5] B. Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs. I. Recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Inform. and Comput.*, 85(1):12–75, 1990.

[6] B. Courcelle, J. A. Makowsky, and U. Rotics. Linear time solvable optimization problems on graphs of bounded clique-width. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 33(2):125–150, 2000.

[7] W. H. Cunningham and J. Edmonds. A combinatorial decomposition theory. *Canad. J. Math.*, 32(3):734–765, 1980.

[8] E. Dahlhaus. Parallel algorithms for hierarchical clustering, and applications to split decomposition and parity graph recognition. *Journal of Algorithms*, 36(2):205–240, 2000.

[9] E. Eiben, R. Ganian, and O. Kwon. A single-exponential fixed-parameter algorithm for Distance-Hereditary Vertex Deletion. In P. Faliszewski, A. Muscholl, and R. Niedermeier, editors, *41st International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2016*, volume 58 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 34:1–34:14, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2016. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.

[10] E. M. Eschen, C. T. Hoàng, J. P. Spinrad, and R. Sritharan. On graphs without a C_4 or a diamond. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 159(7):581–587, 2011.

[11] M. Farber. On diameters and radii of bridged graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 73(3):249–260, 1989.

[12] U. Feige, M. Hajiaghayi, and J. R. Lee. Improved approximation algorithms for minimum weight vertex separators. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 38(2):629–657, 2008.

[13] F. V. Fomin, P. A. Golovach, D. Lokshtanov, and S. Saurabh. Intractability of clique-width parameterizations. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(5):1941–1956, 2010.

[14] F. V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov, N. Misra, and S. Saurabh. Planar F-Deletion: approximation, kernelization and optimal FPT algorithms. In *2012 IEEE 53rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science—FOCS 2012*, pages 470–479. IEEE Computer Soc., Los Alamitos, CA, 2012.

[15] A. C. Giannopoulou, B. M. P. Jansen, D. Lokshtanov, and S. Saurabh. Uniform kernelization complexity of hitting forbidden minors. In *Automata, languages, and programming. Part I*, volume 9134 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 629–641. Springer, Heidelberg, 2015.
[16] E. Gioan and C. Paul. Split decomposition and graph-labelled trees: characterizations and fully dynamic algorithms for totally decomposable graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 160(6):708–733, 2012.
[17] A. Gupta. Improved results for directed multicut. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2003, January 12-14, 2003, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.*, pages 454–455, 2003.
[18] P. Hliněný and S. Oum. Finding branch-decompositions and rank-decompositions. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 38(3):1012–1032, 2008.
[19] E. Howorka. A characterization of distance-hereditary graphs. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)*, 28(112):417–420, 1977.
[20] B. M. P. Jansen and M. Pilipczuk. Approximation and kernelization for chordal vertex deletion. In *28th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017, January 16-19, 2017, Barcelona, Spain.*, 2017. To appear.
[21] M. M. Kanté, E. J. Kim, O. Kwon, and C. Paul. An FPT algorithm and a polynomial kernel for linear rankwidth-1 vertex deletion. In *10th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2015, September 16-18, 2015, Patras, Greece*, pages 138–150, 2015.
[22] E. J. Kim, A. Langer, C. Paul, F. Reidl, P. Rossmanith, I. Sau, and S. Sikdar. Linear kernels and single-exponential algorithms via protrusion decompositions. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 12(2):Art. 21, 41, 2016.
[23] O. Kwon and S. Oum. Unavoidable vertex-minors in large prime graphs. *European J. Combin.*, 41:100–127, 2014.
[24] J. M. Lewis and M. Yannakakis. The node-deletion problem for hereditary properties is NP-complete. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 20(2):219–230, 1980.
[25] L. Lovász. Matroid matching and some applications. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 28(2):208–236, 1980.
[26] W. Mader. Über die maximalzahl kreuzungsfreierh-wege. *Archiv der Mathematik*, 31(1):387–402, 1978.
[27] J. B. Orlin. A fast, simpler algorithm for the matroid parity problem. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization, 13th International Conference, IPCO 2008, Bertinoro, Italy, May 26-28, 2008, Proceedings*, pages 240–258, 2008.
[28] S. Oum. Rank-width and vertex-minors. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 95(1):79–100, 2005.
[29] S. Oum. Approximating rank-width and clique-width quickly. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 5(1):Art. 10, 20, 2009.
[30] S. Oum and P. Seymour. Approximating clique-width and branch-width. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 96(4):514–528, 2006.

(Kim) CNRS-Université Paris-Dauphine, Place du Marechal de Lattre de Tassigny, 75775 Paris cedex 16, France

(Kwon) Institute of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany.

E-mail address: eunjungkim78@gmail.com

E-mail address: ojoungkwon@gmail.com